REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 280 24 EA 000 999

THE SCHOOL BOARD AS AN AGENCY FOR RESOLVING CONFLICT.
BY- LIPHAM, JAMES M. AND OTHERS
WISCONSIN UNIV., MADISON

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0338 PUB DATE AUG 67
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-001
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.00 HC-$8.00 198P.

DESCRIPTORS- SCHOOL DISTRICTS, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, *CONFLICT RESOLUTION, *SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, *BOARD OF EDUCATION ROLE, SOCIAL SYSTEMS, THEORIES, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, ROLE THEORY, *FINANCIAL SUPPORT, *BUDGETING, TEACHERS, PUBLIC OFFICIALS, PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY ATTITUDES, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, HYPOTHESIS TESTING, MADISON,

VIEWING ADMINISTRATION AS A SOCIAL PROCESS, A THREE-YEAR STUDY WAS MADE OF THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL BOARD AS AN AGENCY FOR RESOLVING CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY. ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD WERE ASSESSED BY INTERVIEWING 1,794 CITIZENS, 240 TEACHERS, 183 PUBLIC OFFICIALS, AND 90 SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN 12 WISCONSIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR SIZE, WEALTH, NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, COMMUNITY CONTROVERSY, AND FISCAL DEPENDENCE-INDEPENDENCE. CONFLICT RESOLUTION WAS ASSESSED BY OBSERVING SCHOOL BOARDS DURING THE BUDGET ADOPTION PROCESS. ANALYSIS INDICATED THAT CONSENSUS IN ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD AND RESOLUTION OF SCHOOL BOARD ROLE CONFLICT WERE NOT RELATED EITHER TO CHANGE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOLS OR TO CHANGE IN ALLOCATIONS TO SELECTED BUDGET CATEGORIES. CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS WITHIN AND BETWEEN CERTAIN REFERENCE GROUPS, ESPECIALLY CITIZENS AND TEACHERS, WAS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANTLY RELATED TO THE LEVEL OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND THE NATURE OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS. SCHOOL BOARDS TENDED TO ENGAGE IN ROLE AVOIDANCE, SELDOM RESOLVED CONFLICT IN OPEN MEETINGS, TENDED TO BE INTRA-ORGANIZATIONALLY ORIENTED ON EDUCATIONAL ISSUES, AND WERE EXTRA-ORGANIZATIONALLY ORIENTED ON ECONOMIC ISSUES. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES INCLUDE DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ROLE DISSENSUS AND ROLE CONFLICT AND GIVING EQUAL ATTENTION TO BOTH ROLE AND PERSONALITY DETERMINANTS OF BEHAVIOR. (JK)

PA 24

ED016280

BR FINAL REPORT
~~Project No.~~ 5-0338~~(2-12-1)~~
Contract No. OE 5-10-001

THE SCHOOL BOARD AS AN AGENCY FOR RESOLVING CONFLICT

August 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 000 959

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE SCHOOL BOARD AS AN AGENCY FOR RESOLVING CONFLICT

Project No. 5-0338-2-12-1
Contract No. OE 5-10-001

James M. Lipham
Russell T. Gregg
Richard A. Rossmiller

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with pleasure that the investigators express sincere appreciation to those who contributed so much to the research project reported herein.

To those graduate students who worked on the project while enrolled in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Wisconsin, appreciation is expressed for their creative contributions and dedicated efforts. Their work on both the basic project and their related studies enhanced considerably the project outcomes.

To the personnel of the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Wisconsin, a debt of gratitude is expressed for their assistance with certain aspects of the study related to instrumentation, sampling, interviewing, coding, and data processing. Without the services of this unique statewide facility the massive individual interviewing of citizens would never have been possible.

To the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Assistant Superintendents, and other staff members of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction appreciation is due for their help in selecting the school districts for study and in providing access to the financial data contained in the school district reports.

To the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, appreciation is expressed not only for the initial stimulus to undertake the study, but also for constructive suggestions throughout the conduct of the study. To the Executive Secretary and the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, particular appreciation is felt for their acts of endorsement of the study.

To the boards of education and the superintendents of schools in each of the twelve Wisconsin school districts included in the study, appreciation is expressed for their endorsement of the interviewing of individual citizens, elected officials, school teachers, and school board members and for their willingness to subject their own behavior to observation and analysis.

To the State of Wisconsin, for financial support of research at the University of Wisconsin and to the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for additional funding of the research project, appreciation is expressed.

Thus, each of the several groups named above contributed: the project staff in the Department of Educational Administration; the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory; the State Department of Public Instruction; the Wisconsin Association of School Boards; the boards, superintendents, teachers, officials, and citizens in the twelve Wisconsin school districts; and the taxpayers in the State and the Nation. But of greater importance than the contribution of any one individual or group is that sense of commitment and cooperation both felt and expressed throughout the conduct of the study toward the end that education be improved. It is the hope of the investigators that this study contributes ultimately toward that end.

J.M.L.
R.T.G.
R.A.R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. ii

LIST OF TABLES. vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Theoretical Basis 1

Administration as a Social Process. 1
The School Board as an Interstitial Body. 3
Summary 5

Related Research. 5

Role Studies. 6
Finance Studies 8

The Major Hypotheses. 14

Overview of the Report. 15

II. DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY 16

Selection of School Districts 16

Collection of Expectations Data 20

Selection of Respondents. 20
The Interview Instrument. 25
Determination of Consensus in Expectations. 28

Measurement of Conflict Resolution. 29

The Observer's Report 29
School Board Member Reactionnaire 31
Procedure for Obtaining Role Conflict Resolution. 31
Resolution of Conflict Score. 32

Chapter Page

Establishment of Criterion Measures. 34

Financial Support Measures 34
Budget Allocation Data 34
Sources of Financial Support and Budget Allocation Data. 35

Procedures Employed in Handling of Data. 35

Measurement of Consensus 35
Statistical Treatment. 38

III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. 40

Consensus in Expectations. 40

Consensus Patterns 46
General Consensus in Expectations and Financial Support. 55
High and Low Consensus in Expectations and Financial Support. 63
Consensus in Expectations and Change in Financial Support. 67
Consensus in Expectations and Budget Allocation. . 70
High and Low Consensus in Expectations and Budget Allocation 77
Consensus in Expectations and Change in Budget Allocation 80

Resolution of Conflict 83

Resolution of Conflict and Financial Support . . . 87
Resolution of Conflict and Budget Allocation . . . 89

IV. INVESTIGATIONS TANGENTIAL TO THE RESEARCH PROJECT . . . 93

Expectations for the School Board Role and Selected Financial Variables. 94

Expectations and Satisfactions of Effective and Ineffective School Board Members 95

Values, Belief Systems, and Satisfaction With the School Board Role. 97

Chapter Page

Personal Characteristics and Board Member Reactions to Issues. 99

Education Level, Family Income and Expectations of Citizens 101

Political Party Identification and Expectations for Local Schools. 103

Expectations of Parochial- and Public-School Oriented Citizens. 105

Expectations and School District Innovativeness. . . 107

Consensus in Expectations and Conflict Resolution. . 109

Newspaper Reports of Conflict Regarding the Schools. 110

Expectations of Community Influentials and Selected Community and Personal Variables 112

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 113

Summary. 113

Procedures 114
Findings 115

Conclusions. 118

Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 118
The Interstitial Role of the School Board. 120
Financial Support and Budget Allocations 122
Resolution of Conflict in the School Board Role. . 123

BIBLIOGRAPHY 126

APPENDICES 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
2.1 Placement of 12 School Districts in Matrix of Variables Used in Their Selection 18

2.2 Characteristics of 12 Districts on the Criteria Used in the Selection of School Districts for the Study 19

2.3 Percentage Distribution of Completed Interviews and Reasons for Non-Responses, by School Districts. 21

2.4 Comparison of Age, Years of School Completed, Family Income, and Occupational Status of the Sample of 1,794 Citizens With 1960 Wisconsin Census Data. 23

2.5 Comparison of the Citizen Sample Utilized In the Present Study to the Epstein Random Sample of Adult Wisconsin Citizens, By Political Party Identification 24

2.6 Number of Interviews Completed in Each District by Groups of Interviewees. 26

2.7 Types of Questions Used in the Basic Interview Schedule for Computing Consensus 28

2.8 Scale for Determining the Participation Score of School Board Members 30

2.9 The Number of Respondents and the Percent of the Group Needed for Consensus in Groups of Various Sizes 36

2.10 Number of People Needed to Respond In a Certain Manner in Order to Conclude that Consensus Existed in That Group 37

3.1 Within-Group Consensus Indices for Citizens, Public Officials, School Board Members and Teachers in the 12 School Districts. 41

3.2 Cochran Q Values and Hoyt Reliability Coefficients for the Within-Group Consensus Indices. 42

3.3 Range, Mean, Standard Deviation, and Values One Standard Deviation Above and Below the Mean of the Within-Group Consensus Indices 43

Table Page

3.4 Between-Group Consensus Indices Between Citizens, Teachers, School Board Members, and Public Officials in Each School District 44

3.5 Range, Mean, Standard Deviation and Values One Standard Deviation Above and Below the Mean of the Between-Group Consensus Indices 44

3.6 Cochran Q Values and Hoyt Reliability Coefficients for the Between-Group Consensus Indices 45

3.7 Number of High, Medium, and Low Within- and Between-Group Consensus Indices for each of the 12 Districts. . . 46

3.8 Analyses of Variance--Within-Group Consensus Indices According to Selection Criteria 47

3.9 Analyses of Variance--Between-Group Consensus Indices According to Selection Criteria 48

3.10 Number of Times Within-Group Consensus was Found Per Question and Per Question Per Group, According to Type of Question 49

3.11 Number of Times Between-Group Consensus was Found Per Question and Per Comparison, According to Type of Question. 50

3.12 Number of Times and the Questions Involved When Two Groups had Within-Group Consensus in Opposite Directions. 53

3.13 Correlations--Financial Support, 1963-64, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 57

3.14 Correlations--Financial Support, 1964-65, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 59

3.15 Correlations--Financial Support, 1965-66, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 60

3.16 Districts in Which Various Reference Groups had High and Low Consensus Within and Between Groups in Expectations for the School Board Role 64

Table Page

3.17 Analyses of Variance--Financial Support, 1964-65, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 65

3.18 Analyses of Variance--Financial Support, 1965-66, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 66

3.19 Correlations--Change in Financial Support, 1963-64 to 1965-66, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. . . 68

3.20 Analyses of Variance--Change in Financial Support, 1964-65 to 1965-66, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role. 69

3.21 Correlations--Budget Allocation, 1963-64, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 71

3.22 Correlations--Budget Allocation, 1964-65, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 73

3.23 Correlations--Budget Allocation, 1965-66, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. 75

3.24 Analyses of Variance--Budget Allocation, 1964-65, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 79

3.25 Analyses of Variance--Budget Allocation, 1965-66, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 81

3.26 Correlations--Change in Budget Allocation, 1963-64 to 1965-66, and Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role Within and Between Various Reference Groups. . . 82

Table Page

3.27 Analyses of Variance--Change in Budget Allocation, 1964-65 to 1965-66, and Consensus Within and Between Reference Groups in Districts Having High and Low Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role 84

3.28 Conflict Resolution Score for Each School Board for Four Measures of Conflict Resolution. 85

3.29 Mean Intensity Score, Rank and Number of Issues Acted Upon by Each of the 12 School Boards 86

3.30 Types of Issues Upon Which the 12 School Boards Took Action 87

3.31 Analyses of Variance--Financial Support, 1964-65 to 1965-66, in Districts Having High and Low Scores on Conflict Resolution Using Four Methods for Measuring Conflict Resolution by the School Board 88

3.32 Analyses of Variance--Change in Financial Support, 1964-65 to 1965-66, in Districts Having High and Low Scores on Conflict Resolution Using Four Methods for Measuring Conflict Resolution by the School Board. 89

3.33 Analyses of Variance--Budget Allocation, 1965-66, in Districts Having High and Low Scores on Conflict Resolution Using Four Methods for Measuring Conflict Resolution by the School Board. 90

3.34 Analyses of Variance--Change in Budget Allocation, 1964-65 to 1965-66, in Districts Having High and Low Scores on Conflict Resolution Using Four Methods for Measuring Conflict Resolution by the School Board. 92

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research was to investigate the nature of the role of the board of education as an agency for resolving conflict between the school organization and the larger community. The central thesis of the study was that both the degree of consensus in expectations for the school board role and the degree of resolution of conflict by the board bear systematic and meaningful relationships to both change in the level of local financial support for the schools and change in the nature of budgetary allocations for education. To investigate these relationships, the research was conducted with regard to a particular theoretical point of view. It was concerned with four major variables, consensus in expectations, resolution of conflict, level of financial support, and nature of budgetary allocations. It dealt tangentially with several intermediate ancillary variables. In this chapter the salient literature related to each of the foregoing is summarized, the basic hypotheses are presented, and a brief overview of the report is given.

The Theoretical Basis

This research was based on the theoretical framework of administration as a social process and the theoretical placement of the board of education as an interstitial body between the organization and the community.

Administration as a Social Process

Administration has been conceptualized from two approaches, one representing the sociological or rational model point of view, the other, the psychological or natural system model point of view. In the rational model, the organization is viewed much like a machine with manipulable parts which may be modified to increase the efficiency of the whole--virtually "organization against people." Selznick[1], Gouldner[2], and Merton[3] have developed various models of the sociological approach, based in part upon Weberian[4] principles, in order to describe and order organizational phenomena. But in the natural system model, the individuals are the most significant component of an organization and the achievement of individual goals is given primacy--virtually "people against organization." Roethlisberger[5], Mayo[6], and Argyris[7] have stressed the psychological view. As many have recognized, somewhere between these divergent views there hopefully lies a more productive means for analyzing administration. One of these, social systems theory, attempts to synthesize these divergent views. It was in terms of this theory that the research reported herein was conducted.

---

[1] Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1947).

[2] Alvin W. Gouldner, "Organizational Analysis", Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, eds. Robert R. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., (New York: Basic Books, 1959), pp. 400-428.

[3] Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (rev. ed.; Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957).

Parsons[8] and his colleagues proposed a basic theory of human action which delineates the primary components of social systems theory. Getzels and others[9] adapted this theory into a functional model of administration as a social process, in which a social system was defined as two or more people interacting to achieve common goals. This social system involves both normative and personalistic dimensions which are conceptually independent but phenomenonally interactive. One dimension, the normative, is described by values within the culture and roles within the organization. The other dimension, the personal, is described by the values held by the individual and the need-dispositions within the individual. The elements comprising the two dimensions of a social system interact within the framework of the system to produce observed behavior.

---

[4] Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization Translation by Talcott Parsons (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press and Falcon's Wing Press, 1947), pp. 330-332.

[5] Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939).

[6] Alton Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Harvard Business School, 1945).

[7] Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957).

[8] Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951); and Talcott Parsons and E. A. Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951).

[9] Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process", School Review 55 (Winter, 1957), 423-44; Jacob W. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen, "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System," Dynamics of Instructional Groups, N.S.S.E. Yearbook, Part II (Chicago: The Society, 1960), 53-82; and Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

According to this theory, administration may be examined from three stances. Structurally, administration may be considered as a hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships within this social system. Functionally, within this hierarchy of relationships is the locus for allocating and integrating roles in order to achieve the goals of the system. Operationally, administrative processes take place in environments characterized by person-to-person relationships. Thus, any given relationship within the administrative structure is enacted in two dynamic and separate personal situations, one embedded in the other. This relationship is perceived and organized by each role incumbent in terms of his needs and goals, skills, and experiences. The two situations are related to the extent that the individuals' perceptions are mutual.

Theoretically, the central question thus becomes, "To what extent do complementary role incumbents in a given social system tend to agree or disagree in the expectations they hold for their respective roles?" In terms of the present investigation, the focal position of which is the school board role, the primary antecedent variable thus becomes, "To what extent does agreement or disagreement exist in the expectations held for the school board role?"

The School Board as an Interstitial Body

In the application of social systems theory to the school organization, Parsons[10] developed a taxonomy of function, consisting of the "technical-system" level, the "managerial-system" level, and the "institutional-system" (community) level. He stated that the board of education is an interstitial body between the managerial-system level and the community-system level and he hypothesized that the nature of this interstitial placement bears a crucial relationship to the procurement of resources from outside the school organization.

Parsons delineated the hierarchical aspect of the school system in terms of function or responsibility. In his terms, the technical system level in an educational organization performs the actual processes of teaching. Higher order decisions must be made concerning the following two elements: the resources necessary to perform the technical functions and the relations of the technical system to the population as a whole. The level at which these decisions are made is termed the managerial system level.

---

[10] Talcott Parsons, "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Organization," Administrative Theory in Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), pp. 40-72.

Just as the technical system is controlled and serviced by the managerial system, so is the managerial system controlled by the institutional level. Parsons stated, "In the educational field . . . I would put school boards with their representative functions in the local community in this category."[11] This is the "mediating structure between the particular managerial organization--and hence the technical organization it controls--and the higher-order community interests which, on some level, it is supposed to 'serve'".[12]

Parsons then discussed the points of articulation between the systems levels as follows:

> The essential focus of the qualitative break in line authority. . . is the managerial _responsibility_ assumed by the executive and the managerial organization which he, in many cases, heads. This . . . is not a mere "delegation" where the executive is commissioned to carry out the "details" while his superiors decide all the "policies". This is because it is not possible to perform the functions of focusing legitimation and community support and at the same time act as the active management of it. . . the "board", or whatever structural form it takes, is a mediating structure between the affairs of the organization at the managerial level and its "public".[13]

As a mediating structure, the school board may be seen as neither wholly within nor wholly outside the organization. It may be considered to be an interstitial body with the responsibility for mediating between the public at large and the managerial and technical systems of the organization. To the extent that board members reflect the attitudes and values of the community in securing financial support and in allocating expenditures, they can be said to be functioning within an extra-organizational framework. To the extent that they reflect the attitudes, values, and needs of the organized profession, they can be said to be operating in an intra-organizational setting.

The school board, in its position as an interstitial body between the managerial level and the larger society, plays a crucial role in the procurement and disposal functions of the school organization. In speaking of these functions of the school board, Parsons wrote:

---

[11] _Ibid._, p. 44.

[12] _Ibid._, p. 45.

[13] _Ibid._, pp. 47-48.

> The prominence of the financial aspect of the procurement responsibilities is in the first instance a result of the fact that money is the generalized facility per excellence. It is also particularly prominent in a society so heavily oriented to economic values and functions (properly understood) as the American is. But it is by no means the only relevant input at the institutional level. Perhaps second in importance in most cases is the factor of power in a technical political sense which cannot be fully explained here. The essential point is the "subsumption" of organizational goals under the more generalized goal-structure of the still higher-level social structure and therefore the explicit or implicit "authorization" to embark on the organizational activities in question and to "take them seriously" to the degree to which that is done. A very important aspect of what is sometimes called the struggle for power in a society consists in this competition for support and authorization among the many different organized interests of society.[14]

Summary

Thus, the theory of administration as a social process provided a theoretical basis for the focus on role expectations. Parsons' placement of the school board as an interstitial agency which serves primarily as a mediating body provided a basis for predicating that the role of the school board, among other tasks, is to resolve to as great a degree as possible conflicts which occur as a result of extra-organizational expectations and intra-organizational expectations and, further, that the extent to which the board is able to resolve such conflicts bears a relationship to the procurement and allocation of resources for the organization in a competitive society.

Related Research

Research studies providing the background for this investigation may be broadly classified into those dealing with role consensus and conflict, on the one hand, and with the procurement and allocation of resources, on the other.

---

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

Role Studies

Prior to an examination of related studies of the school board role, it was essential to accept a definition of social role which was compatible with the theoretical framework utilized. In defining the meaning of role, Linton[15] stated that a social system is made up of statuses, or positions, and that each position possesses certain rights and duties. These rights and duties are defined in terms of expectations for behavior on the part of the individual who occupies the position. The individual performs a role when he puts these rights and duties into effect. Newcomb[16] stated that role behavior is attached to a certain position within the social system. Parsons and Shils[17] referred to role as what a person does: that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process.

Accepting Linton's definition of role as the dynamic aspects of positions, offices, and statuses within an institution, Getzels[18] stressed the primacy of expectations for a role when he stated, "A role has certain normative obligations and responsibilities, which may be termed 'role expectations', and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect, he is said to be performing his role." Thus, role expectations are the specifications for behavior by one or more persons in a social system for an individual occupying the role.

Newcomb[19] showed that all of the approved ways of carrying out the necessary functions required of the occupant of a position make up the prescribed role, and role behavior is the behavior on the part of an individual as he performs a role. The role occupant is required to perform the mandatory functions of the role and avoid proscribed behavior. Of course, the expectations for a role are not always clearly perceived by the occupant of the role, nor are the expectations for the role itself always agreed upon by those who prescribe the role. Thus, it is possible that a lack of consensus for a given role may derive from (1) disagreement in expectations for a given role between a role incumbent and the several reference groups having a right to define the role; (2) disagreement among the several reference groups; (3) disagreement within any one of the reference groups; and (4) differences in perceptions regarding any of these types of disagreement. The extent of such within- and between-group agreement may serve as a measure of role consensus.

---

[15] Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: D. Appleton Century Co., 1936), p. 114.

[16] Theodore M. Newcomb, "Role Behavior in the Study of Individual Personality and of Groups," Journal of Personality XVIII (January, 1950), 273-289.

[17] Parsons and Shils, op. cit., p. 23.

[18] Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process," in Administrative Theory in Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 153.

[19] Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: The Dryden Press, 1950), pp. 280-82.

As Charters[20] has pointed out, however, a useful, if not necessary, distinction may be made between the concept of consensus or "dissensus" on role expectations and the concept of role conflict. Although role conflict may bear some relationship to role consensus, for conflict to be present and measurable there is the additional requirement of polarization with respect to an issue or problem which typically requires the role incumbent to select from among alternative courses of action, if only a "yes" or "no" vote, in an effort to resolve the issue or problem.

Literally hundreds of studies of consensus in role expectations have been conducted, only a few of which utilized the school board role as the focal position.[21] Yet those studies typically concluded with highlighting the nature or the extent of consensus in role expectations.[22]

---

[20] W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand-McNally Company, 1963), pp. 718-813.

[21] See, for example, Maurice Stapley, School Board Studies, (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957); Luvern L. Cummingham, "A Community Develops Educational Policy: A Case Study" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1958); Donald J. McCarty, "Motives for Seeking School Board Membership" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959); and Keith Goldhammer, "The School Board and Administration in the American Perspective of Government," American School Board Journal, 129 (Nov., 1954), 29-31 and (Dec. 1954) 29-30.

[22] See, for example, John S. Shaw, "A Study of the Changes in Opinions of School Board Members in Oklahoma on Selected Principles of Education," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964); and Frank E. Williamson, "A Study of the Causes of Discordant School Boards," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1961).

. The studies of public education by Gross[23] were a notable exception in that they did more than simply highlight the extent of role consensus. He found not only that a variety of pressures were placed upon school board members and school superintendents, but also that different subpublics within a community tend to exert differential pressures with regard to different issues. But of even greater importance to the present study was Gross' theory of role conflict resolution, that board members and school superintendents would exhibit differential behavioral orientations according to their perceptions of the legitimacy of the expectations and the sanctions that might be invoked for their failure to conform to the role expectations. Thus, in the present research not only was there assessed the within- and between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role but also there was analyzed the behavior of school boards functioning in their official capacity in the resolution of conflict.

Finance Studies

If the board is conceived as an interstitial body between the school and the larger community, the question may well be raised, "Does either consensus on expectations or conflict resolution bear any relationship to either the extent or the nature of the resources allocated the school organization?" Certain studies in the area of educational finance have either methodological or substantive relevance to the present study.

The problems of the school board in gaining financial support for the schools and in allocating expenditures according to public expectations were highlighted by Johnson who wrote:

> In many respects a city public school system is like any business that operates in that city. It must use scarce resources to produce a service. It has to organize its activities, and it must pay for the goods and services that it uses. It differs from the usual business, however, in that it is not allowed to charge for its service. The "demand" for its educational services cannot be determined in the market place. Instead, the demand is reflected by the funds that the relevant political agency, presumably reflecting the wishes of voters, appropriates for the use of the school system. Nonetheless, the school

---

[23] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern,, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958); and Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).

> is in competition with all other businesses for the sale of its services. When a community votes taxes to pay for schools, the citizens of that community reduce the amount of money that they have to spend for other things.[24]

Public support for education was investigated by James[25] who identified three conditions essential to adequate public school support: (1) the expectation for service from the school must be sufficiently persuasive to receive a majority of the voters' support, (2) a system of voting that allows the voters to express preference on the alternatives for allocating resources among the competing institutional components of the public sector, and (3) availability of resources. James' study generated several significant findings, including evidence that public "shared aspirations" are the underlying reasons for strong local support.

In the same study James defined the position of the state in the matter of allocation of resources. The duties of the state included setting limitations on the authority of local communities to make decisions about resource allocation to education which would reduce services below a minimum level. Although James' study was concerned with differences in financial support among states, and the present study was concerned with differences among school districts, certain of his findings are of interest. It was concluded that states with high levels of financial support were characterized by less variation in per pupil expenditure, by lower tax rates on equalized property assessments, and by a lower level of voluntary expenditures. A relationship existed, although slight, between the wealth of a district and the distribution of funds among line items of the budget. A subsequent study by James[26], however, showed that after a certain level of state support is reached, there is a tendency to substitute state revenues for local taxes.

---

[24] D. Gale Johnson, "Economics and the Educational System," Perspectives on the Economics of Education: Readings in School Finance and Business Management ed. Charles S. Benson (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1963), pp. 376-77.

[25] H. Thomas James, School Revenue Systems in Five States U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 803 (Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, 1961).

[26] H. Thomas James, J. Alan Thomas, and Harold J. Dyck, Wealth, Expenditures, and Decision-Making for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1241, (Stanford, California: Stanford University 1963).

Recognizing educators' and school boards' concern for gaining increased financial support for public education, Hirsch[27] attempted to develop a model to identify determinants of public education expenditures. Hirsch believed that per capita expenditures were affected by at least five main characteristics of the local area: (a) population size; (b) sociological characteristics; (c) physical characteristics; (d) economic characteristics including financial ability to afford education; and (e) governmental characteristics. Another determinant was the scope and quality of education based on the following factors: class size, grouping, quality of teaching staff, teaching load, quality of school administration, and teaching program.

Miner[28] examined the determinants of expenditures for elementary and secondary public education with a focus on the local government administering the schools. The study was accomplished in two phases: first, there was examined the major empirical studies that attempted to specify the legal, economic, social, political, and other factors that influence levels of spending by individual governmental units; second, an empirical study was conducted of the factors influencing school spending in a sample of 1100 local school systems in twenty-three states. Four independent variables were used in the analysis: per capita total expenditure, per capita local expenditure, per pupil total expenditure, and per pupil local expenditure. Miner's comments on his selection of criterion measures are relevant. The author pointed out the reasons for using per-pupil expenditures as the dependent variable, and he also explained the basis for including separate measures of current operating expenditures: total current operating expenditures and current operating expenditures derived from locally collected revenues. Miner stated:

> Studies of educational opportunities usually use expenditures per pupil as the "expenditure" variable. The chief reason for this treatment is that the number of pupils is a measure of need for educational services, and expenditure per pupil is a rough measure of the amount of such services provided. . .
>
> Local school systems obtain resources for financing current expenditures from grants-in-aid out of revenues collected by the state and federal governments and from revenues collected directly by the local school systems. . . The revenues from locally collected taxes for school purposes are determined by forces different from those shaping the amount of aid from state and federal

---

[27] Werner Z. Hirsch, "Determinants of Public Education Expenditures," National Tax Journal, XIII (March, 1960), 29-40.

[28] Jerry Miner, Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963).

> governments. For example, the same factor may influence local tax receipts in one way and state aid in the opposite direction--as when low full property valuation per pupil means low local tax receipts but high state aid via an equalization formula.[29]

A recent study by Geiken[30] is typical of the studies which utilized the criterion variables referred to by Miner. Geiken examined the influence of certain socioeconomic factors in relation to two measures of expenditure for education: current operating expenditure per pupil in average daily membership, and local expenditure per pupil in average daily membership.

Data relative to selected socioeconomic characteristics of local school districts were compiled for a recent project at the University of Wisconsin.[31] Among the conclusions pertinent to the present study were that a unique set of characteristics that precisely distinguished among the 104 school districts could not be identified, and substantial variations in tax rates for school purposes existed among school districts within the state.

The studies cited above centered about financial support for education. It is appropriate to make reference at this point to the allocation of educational expenditures. Benson showed the vulnerable position of the school board in carrying out this function when he wrote:

> There appears to be an "assumption of guilt" attached to public expenditures. The school official who makes an error in judgment on when to buy new equipment is likely to be pilloried. The attitude is not one of "this could happen to anyone in a progressive industry" but rather "he showed poor judgment and we wonder if he is qualified for his office" . . . The bold innovator would stand in a highly exposed position. Thus, most districts would proceed carefully and at about the same pace.[32]

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[30] Lloyd A. Geiken, "An Analysis of Selected Socio-Economic Factors Which Influence Expenditures for Education in 100 Wisconsin School Districts" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, 1965).

[31] LeRoy J. Peterson, et al. Economic Impact of State Support Models of Educational Finance, Cooperative Research Project No. 1495 (Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, 1963).

[32] Charles S. Benson, The Economics of Public Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), pp. 470-71.

A study by Thomas[33] dealt with the effect of levels of resource input, the manner in which the resources are allocated within the school, and the way in which goods and services are combined on differences in mean level of achievement among high schools. Significant in this study was the finding that the manner in which money was spent appeared to be more important than the total level of expenditures. Thomas concluded that there is a relationship between the level of resource inputs and mean test scores. The relationship was due in part to the socioeconomic level of the community. However, when socioeconomic variables were controlled there still remained a significant correlation between resource input and mean test scores.

The study which appears to be most closely related to the present study was an investigation by Bloomberg and Sunshine[34] which dealt with the relationship between securing necessary tax support for the school system and the values and attitudes of leaders in decision-making and of the general public. In developing a model for their study, Bloomberg and Sunshine theorized that (1) for any moment of time the local funds potentially available for public expenditure may be thought of as a relatively narrow range of alternative amounts within limits set by law, tradition, and the taxable wealth of the community; and (2) the amounts actually allocated to various public expenditures for any particular year may be thought of as the results of interaction among the range of funds potentially available, the distribution of perceived needs for each possible public expenditure among the inhabitants of the community (the structure of interests and of values which people try to implement), and the distribution among the inhabitants of the community of capacities to affect the allocation of public monies, that is, the power structure.

Seven hypotheses were set forth by Bloomberg and Sunshine which related favorable community attitudes to high financial support levels. Favorable or supportive attitudes were defined as those which would predispose the individual to accept higher school taxes and to act in ways helpful to their achievement. The authors found that the more favorable the attitudes of the general public toward increasing support, the higher will be the actual level of support. The study confirmed that there is no prevalent public opinion strongly in favor of "all out" support for the schools, despite the well organized efforts of some teachers' and administrators' groups. There was evidence of a wide difference in attitudes and expectations for the public schools held by educators as contrasted with the general public.

---

[33] J. Alan Thomas, "Efficiency in Education: An Empirical Study," Administrator's Notebook XI (October, 1962), 1-4.

[34] Warner Bloomberg, Jr. and Morris Sunshine, Suburban Power Structures and Public Education: A Study of Values, Influence, and Tax Effort (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963).

The problem of indexing local financial effort was considered by Bloomberg and Sunshine[35] to be a special research project in itself. They attempted to determine an index for effort which would rank local financial contributions in relation to the pressure of needs and the limitation of resources. The indicators used were the New York State Department of Education's estimate of each district's full value of property per attending unit (schools in the sample were all in New York State), and each district's school tax rate per thousand dollars of full value of property. The former index was said to be a measure of a district's total tax resources available for public expenditure in relation to the need of the school system for dollars, and the latter was taken as an index of the actual commitment of available financial resources to the public school system. A weighted ranking system was used to obtain scores for specific schools.

A somewhat more complex index of "educational effort" was developed by Jonassen and Peres.[36] In their study of eighty-eight counties in Ohio, they examined the effect of different factors on financial effort for education. The factors which the authors examined, paraphrased below, were found to be correlated with the variable "effort": (1) expenditures met by local taxes relative to worth of taxable resources, (2) expenditure per capita for education relative to per capita retail sales, (This may be construed as an index of "sacrifice" for education), (3) the per capita local tax receipts spent on education, (4) the per pupil expenditure for school district operating expenses derived from taxes collected locally, and (5) an index which combines total per pupil expenditure, the first element listed above, the percent of total expenditure contributed locally, a composite index for "education potential" and the percent of 16 and 17 year olds enrolled in schools.

One can conclude, after an examination of the literature covering financial support for education and allocation of resources within the educational enterprise, that there is room for considerable more research. The school board, as an interstitial body, is expected to be sensitive to expectations of all groups as well as to fulfill its responsibility for the education of the community's youth. The financial aspects of the school board role are complex, but Benson set some guidelines for this role as follows:

---

[35] Bloomberg and Sunshine, op. cit., pp. 44-55.

[36] Christen T. Jonassen and Sherwood H. Peres, Interrelationships of Dimensions of Community Systems (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1960), pp. 34-35, 39.

> Ideally, the economic structure of education would serve several ends: that the total level of educational spending be made adequate for our country's needs; that the distribution of educational resources among individual school units provide a reasonable approximation to equality of opportunity; and that the efficiency of school operations be increased.[37]

The Major Hypotheses

This investigation was concerned with the role of the board of education as an agency for resolving conflict between the school organization and the larger community. The central thesis of this study was that both the degree of consensus in expectations for the school board role and the degree of resolution of school board role conflict bear systematic and cogent relationships to (1) change in the level of local financial support for the schools, and (2) change in the nature of budget allocations for education. On the basis of the preceding theoretical and empirical work cited, the following null hypotheses were subjected to empirical test:

1. There is no difference in change in financial support in school systems of high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role.

2. There is no difference in change in budget allocations in school systems of high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role.

3. There is no difference in change in financial support in school systems of high and low resolution of school board role conflict.

4. There is no difference in change in budget allocations in school systems of high and low resolution of school board role conflict.

---

[37] Charles S. Benson (ed.), Perspectives on the Economics of Education: Readings in School Finance and Business Management (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963), p. 95.

Although each of the terms in the major hypotheses will be defined operationally in the chapter to follow, a brief description of each major term is as follows:

1. Consensus in expectations: the extent to which there existed agreement in expectations for the role of the school board within and between the following groups: lay citizens, elected officials, school board members, and school teachers.

2. Conflict resolution: the extent to which school boards resolved conflict as measured by board member vote, participation, and satisfaction and by observer ratings of board performance.

3. Change in financial support: the extent to which there was a change over a three-year period in total school tax rate, the school tax rate for operation, and the local tax effort per pupil.

4. Change in budget allocations: the extent to which there was a change over a three-year period in allocations for selected line items in the school district budget.

Overview of the Report

In the chapter to follow the design of the study is presented and discussed. Tests of the basic hypotheses are presented in Chapter III. In Chapter IV, the results of the several studies tangential to the major project are summarized. The final chapter consists of a summary, conclusions, and implications for further study.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of this chapter is to provide information basic to the interpretation of findings and, at the same time, to provide sufficient detail concerning the design of the study so that persons who might wish to replicate the study will be able to do so. The chapter is organized to present information concerning: (1) selection of school districts, (2) collection of expectations data, (3) measurement of conflict resolution, (4) establishment of criterion measures, and (5) procedures employed in handling of the data.

Selection of School Districts

The required population was, of course, directly related to the hypotheses to be tested, the kinds of data required for such testing, and the nature of the research design necessary to make available the required data. The 12 school districts which were included in the study were selected from a population of 100 Wisconsin school districts which maintained kindergarten through twelfth grade educational programs. This population of school districts included all Wisconsin districts in which at least 1,400 pupils were in average daily membership during the 1963-64 school year. The 1,400 minimum membership criterion was based upon the assumption that smaller districts might not fully represent the broad range of variables to be included in the study.

In addition to the number of pupils in average daily membership, criteria employed for the selection of the sample of school districts for inclusion in the study were (1) equalized valuation of real property per pupil in average daily membership, (2) ratio of non-public school enrollment to total district enrollment, (3) type of fiscal control (independent of a city council or dependent upon it for funds), and (4) degree of controversy in the school community. Data pertaining to the ratio of non-public school enrollment to the total school enrollment of each district were obtained from Geiken's study of factors influencing expenditures in Wisconsin school districts.[1] Two members of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, and one member of the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Educational Research Service, each of whom had wide acquaintanceship with many of the school districts, rated the districts according to extent of controversy existing in them. Data pertaining to the criteria of size of district, valuation per pupil in average daily membership, and type of fiscal control were obtained from the files of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction.

---

[1] Lloyd A. Geiken, "An Analysis of Selected Socio-Economic Factors Which Influence Expenditures for Current Operation in 100 Wisconsin School Districts (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1965).

The 100 Wisconsin school districts with at least 1,400 pupils in average daily membership were rank-ordered from highest to lowest with respect to the variables of size, wealth, and ratio of non-public enrollment to total school enrollment. The districts were described as high in a variable if they were in the top quarter, medium if they were in the middle two quarters, and low if they were in the low quarter of the distributions. Districts that were mentioned by at least two of the three judges who rated the extent of community controversy were considered high on the degree of controversy variable, those districts that were mentioned by only one judge were considered medium, and those districts that were not mentioned by any judge were considered low. The fiscal structure of the district was classified according to whether it was fiscally dependent or independent of the municipal authorities.

Using the above classifications, a matrix of variables was designed and the 100 school districts were placed in the matrix. Budget limitations made it necessary to select only a limited number of school districts to be included in the study. Twelve of the 100 school districts were selected as satisfying adequately the criteria for the selection of the sample of school districts. An alternate district which also satisfied the criteria was selected as a possible substitute for each of the original 12 districts.

Contacts were made with the superintendents of the 12 districts originally selected. If the superintendent of schools responded favorably with respect to participation in the project, formal approval was sought from the board of education of the district. The superintendents of 10 of the original 12 districts accepted the invitation to participate in the study and the boards of education of these districts likewise agreed to participate. The superintendents and boards of education of the two alternate districts accepted the invitation to participate in those cases where the original districts had declined. The districts finally selected represented a very large number of the combinations of variables which were possible for any 12 of the 100 school districts. Taking two variables at a time, 78 combinations of variables were possible and the 12 districts selected included 71 of these combinations. Table 2.1 shows the placement, in the matrix of variables, of the 12 school districts that participated in the study. Each district was assigned a code letter which will be used for the district throughout this report. A summary of each of the 12 districts regarding their high, medium, or low placement in the rank ordering of each of the selection variables is presented in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.1

PLACEMENT OF 12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN MATRIX OF VARIABLES USED IN THEIR SELECTION

Variable		Valuation/ Pupil in ADM			Non-Public/ Total Enrollment			Fiscal Structure		Community Controversy		
		High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Dep.	Indep.	High	Medium	Low
Size in Total ADM	High	J	A,H	K	J	K,H	A	A,K,J	H		K,H,J	A
	Medium	I,L	B	F	L	I	B,F	L	I,B,F	B,L,F		I
	Low	C,E	G	D	E	G	C,D	E	C,D,G	G	E	C,D
Valuation/ Pupil in ADM	High				E,L,J	I	C	J,E,L	C,I	L	E,J	C,I
	Medium					H,G	A,B	A	B,G,H	B,G	H	A
	Low					K	D,F	K	D,F	F	K	D
Non-Public/ Total Enrollment	High							J,E,L		L	E,J	
	Medium							K	I,H,G	G	H,K	I
	Low							A	B,C,D,F	F,B		C,D,A
Fiscal Structure	Dependent									L	E,J,K	A
	Independent									B,G,F	H	C,D,I

*Districts are represented by Capital Letters

TABLE 2.2

CHARACTERISTICS OF 12 DISTRICTS ON THE CRITERIA USED IN THE SELECTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR THE STUDY

District	Size in Total ADM	Valuation/ Pupils in ADM	Non-Public/ Total School Enrollment	Fiscal Structure	Community Controversy
A	H	M	L	D	L
B	M	M	L	I	H
C	L	H	L	I	L
D	L	L	L	I	L
E	L	H	H	D	M
F	M	L	L	I	H
G	L	M	M	I	H
H	H	M	M	I	M
I	M	H	M	I	L
J	H	H	H	D	M
K	H	L	M	D	M
L	M	H	H	D	H

H - Ranked in the upper quarter of the ranking of 100 districts
M - Ranked in the middle two quarters of the ranking of 100 districts.
L - Ranked in the lower quarter of the ranking of 100 districts.
I - Fiscally independent of a municipal body for budget approval.
D - Fiscally dependent on a municipal body for budget approval.

The 12 school districts composing the sample ranged in size from an enrollment of 1,440 to 22,750 pupils, from $17,339.00 to $43,589.00 in equalized valuation of real property per pupil, and from zero to .526 in ratio of non-public to total district enrollment. Seven of the districts were fiscally independent and five were fiscally dependent. Four of the districts were rated high, four medium, and four low with respect to controversy in the school community.

Since the school districts were selected by the application of a relatively small number of specific criteria, caution should be exercised with regard to the extent to which the findings of the study can be generalized. However, it was found, as reported in the following section, that a random sample of citizens drawn from the 12 school districts was broadly representative of the adult population of the State of Wisconsin. The fact that the random sample of citizens was representative of the total population may be a basis for assuming that the school districts utilized in the study were representative of the total population of school districts.

Collection of Expectations Data

Two of the major hypotheses investigated in this study were stated in terms of consensus in expectations for the school board role. In order to test these hypotheses, it was necessary to obtain data concerning the expectations of various groups of respondents for the school board role. Consensus in expectations was defined as the extent to which there existed within or between groups significant agreement in expectations for the school board role.

Selection of Respondents

In each of the 12 districts included in the study, random samples of citizens and of teachers, and the entire populations of school board members and of public officials were interviewed to obtain data concerning their expectations for the school board role.

The Citizens' Sample. A probability sample of citizens 21 years of age or over who lived in each of the school districts was drawn by the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. Because the districts differed with respect to type of information available, different sampling methods were used in different districts. City-directory type samples were drawn for districts A and I; part city-directory and part rural-census type samples were drawn for districts D, E, and F; and part city-directory and part rural-chunk type samples were drawn for districts B, C, G, H, J, K, and L.

Of the 2,282 addresses selected in the 12 districts, 2,086 or 91 percent proved eligible to be included in the sample. That is, there were occupied dwellings at these addresses. One adult from each household unit was selected for interviewing by use of the Kish[2] procedure. Interview ratios varied from a low of 81 percent in district H to a high of 91 percent in districts C and F. One thousand seven hundred ninety-four citizens in the 12 districts were interviewed, representing 86 percent of the 2,086 eligible interviewees. Table 2.3 shows the percentage distribution of completed interviews in each school district and also of reasons for non-response. Ten percent of the citizens contacted declined to be interviewed; four percent were either away from home or were unable to participate for other reasons.

TABLE 2.3

PERCENTAGE* DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLETED INTERVIEWS AND REASONS FOR NON-RESPONSES, BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

District	Completed Interviews	Non-Responses Due to		
		Refusal	Not at Home	Unable to Participate
A	85	8	2	5
B	88	8	3	1
C	91	7	1	1
D	83	13	2	2
E	86	10	3	1
F	91	9	**	0
G	89	7	3	1
H	81	12	2	5
I	82	15	1	2
J	86	7	4	3
K	86	7	4	3
L	85	11	2	2
All Districts	86	10	2	2

*Rounded to nearest percent
**Less than .5 percent

---

[2] Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory, Manual for Interviewers (Madison: University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1962).

In order to determine whether the sample of citizens drawn from the 12 school districts was representative of the adult population of Wisconsin, several comparisons were made. Table 2.4 compares the sample with the Wisconsin adult population, as reported by the 1960 census, on the characteristics of age, years of school completed, family income, and occupational status. The comparison reveals that the sample of citizens closely resembled the adult population of Wisconsin. The differences revealed by the data in Table 2.4 generally are those which would be expected as a result of using 1960 census data. For example, a somewhat higher percentage of persons in the sample had completed 12 years of school and a slightly lower percentage of persons in the sample had family incomes of less than $5,000 per year. Streich[3] compared the sample of citizens used in this study with respect to their political party identification with a random sample of Wisconsin adult citizens drawn by Epstein[4] in 1962. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 2.5. The close similarities indicated by the data presented in Tables 2.4 and 2.5 indicate rather strongly that the sample of citizens drawn for this study can be considered representative of the adult population of Wisconsin.

The Sample of Professional Staff Members. The sample of professional staff members in each of the districts was drawn by a random procedure. The list of professional staff in each of the districts was obtained from the Official School Directory[5] and a number was assigned to each person on the professional staff with exception of the superintendent of schools. Using a table of random numbers,[6] 20 professional staff members in each district were selected to be interviewed. In this report, the term "teachers" is used when referring to this sample but it should be recalled that the sample included some other professional personnel, such as principals and supervisors.

---

[3] William H. Streich, Political Party Identification and Expectations for Local Schools (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

[4] Leon D. Epstein, Votes and Taxes. (Madison: Institute of Government Affairs, University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1964).

[5] State Department of Public Instruction, Official School Directory, 1964-65 (Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1964).

[6] Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods (Revised Edition; New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958), pp. 280-281.

TABLE 2.4

COMPARISON OF AGE, YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FAMILY INCOME, AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE SAMPLE OF 1,794 CITIZENS WITH 1960 WISCONSIN CENSUS DATA

Age	Sample of 1,794 Citizens (Percent)	Wisconsin 1960 Census (Percent)
21-24*	6.7	7.6
25-29	9.9	9.6
30-34	9.0	10.5
35-39	10.1	10.7
40-44	11.0	10.3
45-49	10.5	9.9
50-54	9.0	9.0
55-59	9.0	8.1
60-64	6.6	7.2
65 and over	17.9	17.1
Not Ascertained	0.3	0.0
	100.0	100.0
Years of School Completed		
8 or fewer	27.5	40.4
9-11	14.9	16.0
12	34.8	28.2
13-15	13.9	8.8
16 or more	8.7	6.6
Not Ascertained	.2	0.0
	100.0	100.0
Family Income		
Less than 1000	3.1	3.8
1,000-1,999	4.7	6.2
2,000-2,999	6.4	7.4
3,000-3,999	7.5	8.6
4,000-4,999	7.3	11.2
5,000-5,999	11.8	13.8
6,000-6,999	11.4	12.6
7,000-9,999	23.0	22.0
10,000-14,999	13.3	10.3
15,000 and over	6.1	4.1
Not ascertained	5.4	0.0
	100.0	100.0

TABLE 2.4 (Continued)

Occupational Status**	Sample of 1,794 Citizens (Percent)	Wisconsin 1960 Census (Percent)
Professional, technical and kindred	12.4	10.0
Farmers and farm managers	11.1	7.5
Managers, officials and proprietors	14.1	7.2
Clerical and kindred	12.5	12.9
Sales	4.8	7.0
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred	14.0	13.7
Operatives and laborers	21.2	28.1
Private household and service workers	9.9	8.3
Other	0.0	5.3
	100.0	100.0

*The number of persons in the age grouping 20-24 as reported by the census was 222,831. This was reduced by 1/5 to obtain the number of persons age 21-24.

**Percentages for the occupational status analysis of the sample are based on n=1228 respondents. The remainder of the respondents (566) were not in the labor force for this code.

TABLE 2.5

COMPARISON OF THE CITIZEN SAMPLE UTILIZED IN THE PRESENT STUDY TO THE EPSTEIN RANDOM SAMPLE OF ADULT WISCONSIN CITIZENS, BY POLITICAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Type of Political Party Identification	Epstein Sample		Present Study Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strong Republican	98	12.91	231	12.88
Republican	135	17.79	319	17.78
Independent Republican	62	8.17	127	7.08
Independent	111	14.62	272	15.16
Independent Democrat	71	9.35	165	9.20
Democrat	167	22.00	367	20.46
Strong Democrat	109	14.37	297	16.55
Apolitical or not ascertained	6	.79	16	.89
Totals	759	100.00	1794	100.00

The Population of School Board Members. The school board population consisted of all school board members in the 12 school districts. The size of the school boards varied from five to nine members. The school boards of the 12 school districts were composed of a total of 90 members. Although the superintendents of schools in the 12 districts were interviewed, their responses were not combined with the responses of the school board members.

The Population of Public Officials. All public officials in each of the school districts who would be eligible to vote on the school district budget if the school district were fiscally dependent were selected for interviewing. The public officials included mayors, city managers, and village presidents; city councilmen and village board trustees; and township chairmen. Although not strictly belonging in the public officials' population, editors of local newspapers were, nevertheless, included in this group of interviewees. The response rate for members of this reference group was virtually 100 percent with 183 out of a possible 189 interviews being completed. In district G, one official; in district H, two officials; and in district K, three officials were not interviewed; in the remaining nine districts, all members of the population of public officials were interviewed. This group composed of public officials, and newspaper editors, will be referred to as "public officials" in the remainder of this report.

Summary. Table 2.6 indicates the number of interviews which were conducted in each of the 12 districts, according to each of the four groups of interviewees. One thousand seven hundred ninety-four citizens, 183 officials, 90 board members and 240 teachers were interviewed, making a total of 2,307 interviewees.

The Interview Instrument

The expectations data required for testing the first two major hypotheses of the study were obtained by the use of a structured interview instrument which was given the title School District Survey (See Appendix A). The interview instrument was developed and tested by the research staff responsible for the study with the cooperation and assistance of the director of the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory and other members of the laboratory staff, the executive secretary and members of the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, and several members of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. The development of the instrument took place over a seven-month period from September, 1964, through March, 1965.

TABLE 2.6

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS COMPLETED IN EACH DISTRICT BY GROUPS OF INTERVIEWEES

District	Citizens	Officials	Board Members	Teachers	Totals
A	141	9	7	20	177
B	142	10	9	20	181
C	169	11	7	20	207
D	137	13	7	20	177
E	149	15	9	20	193
F	162	9	7	20	198
G	163	16	7	20	206
H	144	21	9	20	194
I	140	7	5	20	172
J	150	27	9	20	206
K	150	24	7	20	201
L	147	21	7	20	195
All Districts	1,794	183	90	240	2,307

Originally, the research staff intended to construct different interview instruments for the different groups of interviewees, on the assumption that the amount and kinds of information that persons in each of the groups possessed concerning the school board and the schools would vary considerably from group to group. After thorough discussion and testing, however, this idea was abandoned in favor of the use of a single instrument with only slight modification in the form for use in interviewing school board members (and superintendents of schools). Since comparisons of consensus in expectations for the school board role were to be made within and between groups, e.g., within and between the groups of citizens and of school board members, it was necessary to ask questions of substantially the same content and in the same form of all persons interviewed.

Field testing of the instrument was conducted by the research staff throughout the developmental stages in order to ascertain the suitability of the various questions for the different groups of respondents. A near-final draft was pilot tested by the research staff with school board members of two school districts not participating in the study and by trained interviewers of the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory with more than 200 citizens. In the process of testing and revising the interview instrument it became clear that citizens, in particular, tended to become confused when they were asked questions about the "school board role" even though it was obvious that they did hold certain expectations for the schools. Consequently, it was decided to phrase many of the questions in terms of expectations for the schools, on the assumption that such expectations determined the role of the board of education. On the basis of this decision, items included in the interview schedule pertained to the nature and operation of the school board; to expectations for the schools relative to (1) educational program, (2) pupil personnel, (3) staff personnel, (4) business management, and (5) board image; to satisfaction with, or evaluation of, the schools and the performance of the school board; and to personal factors concerning the respondent. Both structured questions, with varying response categories, and open-ended questions were utilized.

The final form of the interview instrument contained 138 items, 19 of which had sub-items or "probes", the use of which was dependent on the way the interviewee responded to the original item. Two minor differences existed between the interview form used for interviewing citizens, public officials, and teachers and the form used for interviewing school board members. One difference was that for the school board members more detailed questions or "probes" concerning board operation were included. Also, a small number of items included in the interview schedule for citizens, public officials, and teachers were inappropriate when addressed to school board members. A second difference between the two forms, therefore, was that more appropriate items were substituted in the form for school board members. For example, citizens were asked, "How do you find out about the decisions the school board makes at its meetings?" while the school board members were asked, "How are decisions made by the school board publicized?"

The 138 interview schedule items pertained to school board image and operation, expectations for the schools, satisfaction or evaluation, the respondent's knowledge of the school board, and the personal background of the respondent. The items pertaining to expectations for the schools were related to educational program, to pupil personnel, to staff personnel, to business management, and to school plant.

Using the interview instrument described above, the groups of citizens, officials, teachers, and school board members were interviewed during the spring semester of the 1964-65 school year. The citizens and officials were interviewed by trained interviewers employed by the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. The teachers and school board members were interviewed by faculty members and research assistants responsible for conducting the present study. The time required for the interviews ranged from an hour to two hours or more, with the average interview lasting approximately one and one-half hours. The data obtained in each of the interviews were later punched on four IBM cards.

Determination of Consensus in Expectations

Data obtained by the use of the interview instrument with the groups of citizens, public officials, teachers, and school board members made possible the determination of consensus in expectations within and among the groups. The interview schedule was examined critically in order to determine which of the items could best be utilized in the computation of consensus scores. Eighty-four of the 138 questions on the schedule survived this examination. (See Appendix B for a complete listing of the numbers of these questions.) Reasons for not including certain questions in the computation of consensus scores were (1) the question was open-ended and had no predictable response pattern and (2) the question did not elicit an expectations-type response. Table 2.7 gives a summary of the types of questions selected for determining consensus of expectations within and between the groups.

TABLE 2.7

TYPES OF QUESTIONS USED IN THE BASIC INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR COMPUTING CONSENSUS

Type of Question	Number of Questions Used in Consensus Measure	Number of Questions Not Used in Consensus Measure
Expectations questions about:		
Educational program	13	-
Pupil personnel	16	-
Staff personnel	18	-
Image of the board	20	5
Business management	13	-
Unclassified	4	1
Open-ended questions	-	32
Evaluation of school	-	8
Information or knowledge	-	8
Totals	84	54

Consensus within a group was defined as the extent to which the respondents tended to select a single response category when answering an interview question. A procedure was developed, which is explained in the last section of this chapter, to determine whether the proportion of responses in a particular response category for any one group of respondents was large enough that it could have happened by chance no more than five percent of the time. When the number of responses represented at least the minimum proportion required of the group, the group was said to have consensus on that item. The consensus index for the group was the sum of the items on which there was consensus.

Measurement of Conflict Resolution

In order to test the third and fourth hypotheses of the study it was necessary to obtain data pertaining to the resolution of role conflict by the school boards that participated in the study. The research staff, with the advice of consultants, spent a considerable period of time developing a method for measuring role conflict resolution. The method employed utilized the non-participant observer technique as well as the interview technique.

An initial step in the development of a role conflict resolution measure was that of having members of the research group visit two consecutive school board meetings in five school districts that were not to participate in the study. The purpose of these visits was to observe the behavior of school board members in the board meetings. These observations produced certain clues concerning the dynamics of the process of school board deliberation and operation which were discussed by the research personnel and with consultants. It was decided that the following four variables would be considered in the measurement of role conflict resolution (1) the participation of individual board members in deliberating on the issue, (2) the vote taken by the board on the issue, (3) the intensity of the issue under consideration as perceived by members of the board, and (4) the satisfaction of individual board members with the final action taken by the board concerning the issue. Each item brought before the school board and voted on was considered to be an issue, with the exception of approval of minutes, payment of invoices, and adjournment of the meeting. Two instruments, the Observer's Report, and the School Board Member Reactionnaire, were developed for use in the measurement of the resolution of conflict. These instruments are shown in Appendices C and D.

The Observer's Report

The Observer's Report was used by members of the research group to (1) record data concerning the participation of board members in deciding an issue, (2) indicate the result of the vote on the issue, and (3) rate the process employed by the board in resolving the issue. The Observer's Report form also provided for the recording of the nature of the issue under consideration, how the issue got before the board, the name of the school district, date of the school board meeting, and the observer's name.

A school board member was recorded as participating in the resolution of an issue if he asked a question or made a statement about the issue under discussion or if he made a motion, or seconded a motion, related to the issue. To obtain a participation score for a school board on an issue, observers utilized the scale reported in Table 2.8. Because the size of the school boards in the study varied from five to nine members, and because the absence of a member from a meeting could distort the participation score, the participation scale as indicated in Table 2.8 was utilized.

It was the conclusion of the research group that if a school board relied heavily on standing committees it would likely be penalized regarding the participation score obtained during school board meetings. To overcome this problem, reports of standing committees were obtained and members of the committee were counted as participating in deliberation on the issue if their names appeared in the committee report; however, this procedure was necessary for only one school board, that in district H.

TABLE 2.8

SCALE FOR DETERMINING THE PARTICIPATION SCORE
OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

	Required Number of Board Members Participating on a:			
Participation Score	4 Member Board	5 Member Board	6-7 Member Board	8-9 Member Board
5	4	5	6	7
3	3	4	5	6
1	2 or 1	3 or less	4 or less	5 or less

In order to obtain a vote-score for each issue considered by a school board, these scores were assigned as follows: unanimous vote, 7; less than unanimous vote, 4; a single vote majority, 1.

Each observer rated the process utilized by the school board in the resolution of an issue on a ten-point scale. The criteria upon which the observers based their judgments were: (1) the nature of the problem was clearly defined, (2) there was equal opportunity for all participants to voice opinions, (3) alternative solutions were considered, (4) expert opinion was sought and utilized, and (5) school board actions were consistent in the light of adopted policy. School board action approximating the criteria was rated high and action inconsistent with them was rated low.

School Board Member Reactionnaire

At the close of each board meeting, each board member was asked to respond to the two scales on the School Board Member Reactionnaire (Appendix D). The reactionnaire was devised and administered in order to obtain a school board member's reactions to (1) perceived intensity of concern for an issue and (2) personal satisfaction with regard to the board's resolution of an issue. The intensity of concern scale assessed the school board member's perceptions of the degree to which citizens and/or teachers in the school district were concerned with the issue. School board members recorded their perceptions of intensity of concern on a scale ranging from one to ten. Descriptive words along the scale were as follows: 1, no concern; 4, some concern; 7, much concern; and 10, intense concern.

The personal satisfaction scale was designed to assess the individual school board member's satisfaction with the disposition of an issue by the board. This scale was also a ten-point continuum with descriptive words as follows: 1, extremely dissatisfied; 4, dissatisfied; 7, satisfied; and 10, extremely satisfied. Space was also included in the reactionnaire for recording the date of the school board meeting, the district which the school board represented, and a number to identify the school board member who responded to the reactionnaire.

Procedure for Obtaining Role Conflict Resolution

Three consecutive school board meetings in each of the 12 school districts were observed for the purpose of obtaining data relating to role conflict resolution. The Observer's Report and the School Board Member Reactionnaire were utilized for each of the issues resolved at each of the meetings. Three observers of the research staff were assigned to each of the three meetings in a school district according to the following schedule:

Meeting #1	Meeting #2	Meeting #3
Observer A	Observer A	Observer A
Observer B	Observer B	Observer D
Observer C	Observer D	Observer E

According to this schedule, observer A attended all three meetings, observers B and D attended two meetings each, and observers C and E attended one meeting each. This arrangement provided for continuity in the observations and also made it possible for five different observers to observe the board in action. For each district, observer A was designated as the observation-team leader with the responsibility for giving the necessary directions to the board members to obtain their responses to the reactionnaire at the close of each meeting. Observer A served as the official spokesman for the observation team at each of the three board meetings. In addition, he recorded supplementary information such as length of the board meeting, individuals or groups attending the meeting, board members present and absent, and other relevant information.

An Observer's Report was completed by each of the three observers for each of the issues considered by the school board during a meeting. Each observer made his ratings independently of the other observers. At the close of the meeting each school board member present completed a School Board Member Reactionnaire for each issue voted upon during the meeting.

Resolution of Conflict Score

Conflict resolution scores were computed for each school board, using the data pertaining to school board member participation, school board vote, mean observer rating, mean intensity rating, and mean satisfaction rating. These data were obtained by use of the Observer's Report and the School Board Member Reactionnaire. Computation of the conflict resolution score may be stated algebraically as follows:

$$(P + V + O + S)(In) = ICRS$$

$$\frac{\Sigma ICRS}{\Sigma In} = CRS$$

Where: P = Participation Score
V = Vote Score
O = Mean Observer Rating
S = Mean Satisfaction Rating
In = Mean Intensity Rating
ICRS = Issue Conflict Resolution Score
ΣICRS = Sum of Issue Conflict Resolution Scores
ΣIn = Sum of Mean Intensity Ratings
CRS = Conflict Resolution Score

Use of the mean intensity as a multiplication factor, and the sum of the mean intensity ratings as a division factor, yielded a final conflict resolution score per unit of intensity. This score was based upon the assumption that if each of the school boards dealt with issues which they perceived to be of like intensity, the score would be a measure of their conflict resolution. The conflict resolution scores obtained for each of the school boards were comparable and could be subjected to common statistical procedures.

Three modifications of the above defined measure of conflict resolution were devised and were also employed to test hypotheses of this study. The first modification was as follows:

$$(P + O + S)\ (In) = ICRS$$

$$\frac{\Sigma ICRS}{\Sigma In} = CRS$$

This modification omitted the school board vote score because on 167, or 89.3 percent, of the 187 issues, the votes were unanimous.

The second modification took the following form:

$$\frac{(\Sigma O)\ (\Sigma In)}{NI} = CRS$$

Where: NI = Total number of issues
ΣO = Sum of mean observer ratings

This modification utilized only the school board members' perceptions of the intensity of the issue and the observers' ratings of the resolution process.

The third modification was as follows:

$$\frac{\Sigma O}{NI} = CRS$$

This modification was based on the assumption that the observers could be relied upon to provide an accurate measure of a school board's conflict resolution.

Establishment of Criterion Measures

The rationale of this study indicated that the degree of consensus in expectations for the school board role and the degree of resolution of school board conflict could be expected to bear systematic relationships to (1) change in the level of local financial support for schools, and (2) change in the nature of budget allocations in the adopted budgets. In order to test the four major hypotheses of the study, it was necessary to identify appropriate variables related to local financial support and budget allocations, and to standardize the measures of these variables.

Financial Support Measures

Four measures were selected to show the level of financial support in the 12 school districts. These measures were as follows:

1. Total local mill rate for all school purposes. To obtain this measure the total tax levy for school purposes, including debt payments paid directly by the municipality, was divided by the district equalized valuation.

2. Local tax rate for current operation of the schools. To obtain this measure all current operating receipts with the exceptions of local tax receipts and state aids were subtracted from the total disbursements for current operation, and the resulting amount was then divided by the district equalized valuation.

3. Required levy rate for current operation. To obtain this measure the same current operation levy as found for item 2 above was used, but instead of dividing it by the district equalized valuation it was divided by the guaranteed valuation used by the state in the computation of equalization aids.

4. Local tax effort per pupil. To obtain this measure the local tax levy for school purposes was divided by the average daily pupil membership.

Budget Allocation Data

Data were collected concerning 12 items of budget allocation. These were: (1) salaries of professional staff, (2) salaries of clerical workers, (3) textbooks, library books and periodicals, (4) instructional supplies, (5) total instructional costs, (6) salaries of custodians, (7) plant operation, (8) plant maintenance, (9) school lunch, (10) transportation, (11) capital outlay, and (12) debt service.

Sources of Financial Support and Budget Allocation Data

The financial support and budget allocation data were obtained from school district records, from annual reports submitted by the school districts to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, and from records of the Wisconsin Department of Taxation. Data for each of the variables were collected for the school years 1963-64, 1964-65, and 1965-66. Financial support data were standardized among the school districts on the basis of state equalized valuation and the budget allocation data on the basis of average daily pupil membership of the respective school districts. The hypotheses of the study were tested using the data collected for each of the three school years mentioned above and also in terms of changes in level of financial support and in budget allocations during specified periods of time.

Procedures Employed in Handling of Data

In this section of the chapter procedures employed will be discussed in relation to (1) measurement of consensus in expectations for the school board role and (2) statistical treatment of the data.

Measurement of Consensus

Using the definition of consensus as the extent to which there exists "significant" agreement in the responses to questions, a procedure to test such agreement was based upon the statistical inferences which can be made about a proportion.[7] In this context, the term "proportion" refers to a fractional part of a group of discrete individuals. The data of this study, i.e., the number of individuals who responded in a certain manner to an interview item, fit this definition of proportion. When p is used to represent the proportion of individuals in a sample who have a specified characteristic, that is, the proportion who answered in an certain manner, and (1-p) is used to represent the proportion who do not have the specified characteristic, the mean of the sample of size N is p and the standard deviation of the sample is p(1-p). When the unknown proportion of a population is to be estimated, the sample value p is the best single value available. To convert the proportion values to frequency values, the proportion is multiplied by the number in the group being considered and the mean frequency of sample size N is Np and the standard deviation frequency is Np(1-p).

---

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 244-56.

By use of the above mean and standard deviation formulas, together with a correction for continuity, a confidence interval was constructed for each of the reference groups involved in the study. Allowing a chance error of five percent, the upper limit of the confidence interval was operationally defined as the critical value above which a group would have "significant" agreement on the response to an item. By establishing the confidence interval for the proportion of a group which could be expected to answer a particular question in a certain manner and using the upper limit as the critical value, above which would be the area of consensus, the variation in the number of board members, public officials, and citizens who were interviewed was negated. This procedure was of importance because the number of school board members varied among districts from five to nine members, the number of public officials interviewed varied from seven to 27, and the number of citizens interviewed varied from 140 to 169. The effect of the size of the group on the proportion of the group which would have to respond in a certain manner in order to conclude that consensus existed is revealed in Table 2.9. As the size of the group increases, the proportion of the group needed for consensus decreases; however, the probability of getting at least that proportion to respond in a certain manner remains constant.

TABLE 2.9

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS AND THE PERCENT OF THE GROUP NEEDED FOR CONSENSUS IN GROUPS OF VARIOUS SIZES

Number in Group	Needed for Consensus	
	Critical Value Number	Percent
5	5	100.0
7	7	100.0
9	8	88.9
15	12	80.0
20	15	75.0
27	19	70.4
140	82	58.6*
150	88	58.6*
160	93	58.1

*Percent is the same for these two groups because of rounding the critical value to the next higher whole number.

In order to insure that all responses to an interview question would have an equal chance of being selected, the responses to each of the questions used in the measurement of consensus were dichotomized according to whether the response was in agreement with the idea expressed in the question or was in opposition to the idea. A third category was used to include all the responses which were noncomittal or in which the position of the respondent was not ascertained. This third category was not considered a meaningful response and was not utilized in the measurement of consensus. The number of respondents for each of the reference groups required to answer a question in a certain manner in order to conclude that consensus existed is shown in Table 2.10 for each of the 12 districts.

TABLE 2.10

NUMBER OF PEOPLE NEEDED TO RESPOND IN A CERTAIN MANNER IN ORDER TO CONCLUDE THAT CONSENSUS EXISTED IN THAT GROUP

District	Citizens	Officials	Board	Teachers
A	83	8	7	15
B	83	9	8	15
C	98	9	7	15
D	80	10	7	15
E	87	12	8	15
F	94	8	7	15
G	95	12	7	15
H	84	15	8	15
I	82	7	5	15
J	88	19	8	15
K	88	17	7	15
L	86	15	7	15

Within-Group Consensus. The degree of consensus within a group of respondents was measured by the number of interview items, of the possible 84, on which the group had significant consensus. A basic assumption underlying this measure was that the questions used represented a cross-section of the types of items on which the reference groups could be expected to have opinions or expectations with respect to the role of the school board. When the responses of a reference group to a particular question indicated consensus, a value of one was assigned and when consensus did not exist, a value of zero was given. The degree of consensus within a reference group then was found by obtaining the sum of the ones for the group.

The Cochran Q test[8], an analysis of variance for zero, one nominal data, was used to determine if the consensus index discriminated between districts. If the Q was greater than or equal to the chi square table value, the implication was that the proportions of the different types of responses differed significantly. The Hoyt[9] reliability coefficient was computed for each set of consensus scores.

In addition to whether or not consensus was found for a group on a particular item, a record was kept regarding the response category in which the consensus was located. The record told "how" the group felt about a particular interview item.

Between-Group Consensus. In order to have consensus between two groups on a particular interview item, it was necessary to have consensus on that item within each of the groups. The degree of within-group consensus was measured as the number of items on which the two groups had consensus in the same direction. This measure of consensus was limited, of course, by the degree of consensus exhibited by each of the groups being compared. The Cochran Q test and the Hoyt reliability coefficient were also computed for each set of between-group consensus scores.

Statistical Treatment

To relate the data concerning consensus in expectations for the school board role, and those relating to the resolution of conflict, to the criterion measures of (1) local financial support and (2) budget allocation, two statistical procedures were employed. One was the Spearman rank order coefficient of correlation and the other was the analysis of variance technique.

Rank order coefficient of correlations were utilized for determining the relationships between consensus in expectations and (1) the four financial support variables and (2) the twelve budget allocation variables for the various school years encompassed by the study. Rank order correlation coefficients also were used for determining the relationships between consensus in expectations and changes in the financial support variables, and changes in the budget allocation variables, over a period of time. In any particular case where there were more than four tied ranks among the districts on a particular variable, product-moment correlation coefficients[11] were used instead of the Spearman rank coefficients.

---

[8] Sidney Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 161-166.

[9] Cyril Hoyt, "Test Reliability Obtained by Analysis of Variance," *Psychometrika*, 6 (June, 1941), pp. 153-60.

[10] George A. Ferguson, *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 179-81.

Analyses of variance were utilized to test for the significance of the differences on the financial support variables, and the differences on the budget allocation variables, between the four districts that ranked high and the four districts that ranked low on these variables. Analyses of variance were also performed to test the significance of differences found between the four high and the four low districts with respect to changes in the financial support and the budget allocation variables over a period of time.

The Spearman rank order coefficient of correlation was also utilized to determine the relationships of the conflict resolution scores to the local financial support variables and to the budget allocation variables in the 12 school districts. Statistical significance of the computed rank order correlations was determined by referring to the table of critical values reported by Ferguson[12]. Again, where there were more than four tied ranks product-moment coefficients were utilized in place of the Spearman rank coefficients. The product-moment coefficients also were tested for significance by using a table of critical values reported by Ferguson.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 182.

[12] Ibid., p. 316.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter are reported (1) data concerning consensus in expectations for the school board role and the relationship between consensus in expectations and the criterion variables of financial support and budget allocation and (2) data concerning resolution of conflict by the school board and the relationship between resolution of conflict and these same criterion variables. Results of the tests of the null hypotheses posed for the study also will be reported. The first portion of the chapter consists of (1) a brief analysis of consensus measures; (2) an analysis of the relationship between consensus in expectations within and between groups and financial support of the schools; and (3) an analysis of the relationship between consensus in expectations within and between groups and allocations to 12 budget categories. The second part of the chapter contains (1) a brief review of the conflict resolution measures; (2) an analysis of the relationship between conflict resolution and financial support of the schools; and (3) an analysis of the relationship between conflict resolution and allocations to 12 budget categories.

Consensus in Expectations

Responses to the interview schedule which was used with citizens, teachers and elected officials, and data from the modified interview schedule which was used with school board members, provided the raw data for measurement of the degree of consensus in expectations of these groups for the role of the school board. Eighty-four of the 138 questions asked in the interview schedule were used to compute consensus in expectations for the school board role. For purposes of this study consensus was defined as the extent to which there existed significant agreement in the responses to questions and the test for consensus was based upon the statistical inferences which can be made about a proportion.

The pattern of responses to a particular question of each reference group in each school district was tested using the procedures described in Chapter II to determine whether or not consensus on that question existed. By assigning a one to each question on which a group had consensus and a zero to each question on which the group did not have consensus, a matrix of zero, one data was constructed with the 12 districts in the rows and the 84 questions in the columns. The sum of the one's in any row was the number of questions, of the 84 tested, on which the group had consensus, i.e., the within-group consensus index for that particular district. The sum of the one's in any column was the number of districts which had consensus on that particular question. The within-group consensus indices for the four groups in each of the districts are given in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1

WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES FOR CITIZENS, PUBLIC OFFICIALS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND TEACHERS IN THE TWELVE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

District	Citizens	Public Officials	School Board Members	Teachers
A	54	24	13	41
B	51	15	32	40
C	59	33	14	44
D	57	32	22	39
E	46	23	33	34
F	63	21	23	40
G	50	38	11	37
H	62	44	30	48
I	59	22	26	47
J	47	38	26	47
K	58	43	19	40
L	49	43	18	47

To test whether the consensus indices did, indeed, discriminate between districts, the Cochran Q test, an analysis of variance test for zero, one nominal data, was used. The Q values obtained for the within-group consensus indices were: citizens, 34.048; officials, 80.853; board members, 61.195; and teachers, 21.097. Reference to a chi square table indicated that differences among the consensus indices were significant at the .01 level for citizens, public officials and school board members and significant at the .05 level for teachers. Hoyt reliability coefficients were computed for each consensus score and were found to be as follows:

✓

citizens, .685; public officials, .874; school board members, .793; and teachers, .484. Table 3.2 contains a summary of the Cochran Q values and their level of significance, as well as a summary of the Hoyt reliability coefficients, for the within-group consensus indices.

TABLE 3.2

COCHRAN Q VALUES AND HOYT RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES

Group	Cochran Q Values	Level of Significance*	Hoyt Reliability Coefficient
Citizens	34.048	.01	.685
Public Officials	80.853	.01	.874
School Board Members	61.195	.01	.793
Teachers	21.097	.05	.484

* $\chi^2_{.99} = 24.72$ and $\chi^2_{.95} = 19.68$ with eleven degrees of freedom

The within-group consensus indices for the 12 citizen groups revealed a range of from 46 to 63 questions on which there was consensus; the range for the groups composed of public officials was from 15 to 44; for the school board member groups the range was from 11 to 33; and for the groups composed of teachers the range was from 34 to 48. The mean, standard deviation, and values one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean were computed for each of the four groups. (See Table 3.3)

Using _a priori_ reasoning that it was necessary for each of two groups to have within-group consensus on a response to a particular question before the groups could have between-group consensus, a record was kept of the nature of the response whenever a group had within-group consensus. This record provided a matrix of zero, one data from which between-group consensus was ascertained. A one indicated that the two groups being compared were in agreement

TABLE 3.3

RANGE, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND VALUES ONE STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEAN OF THE WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES

Groups	Range		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean + 1 S.D.	Mean - 1 S.D.
	High	Low				
Citizens	63	46	54.58	5.62	60.20	48.96
Public Officials	44	15	31.33	9.61	40.94	21.72
School Board Members	33	11	22.25	7.12	29.37	15.13
Teachers	48	34	42.00	4.34	46.34	37.66

in their response to the question; a zero indicated lack of agreement--either because each group had within-group consensus but in opposite directions or because one or both of the groups did not have within-group consensus. The sum of the one's in a row provided the between-group consensus index, e.g., in the matrix for the consensus between citizens and teachers, the sum of one's in row A was the index of the degree of consensus between the citizens and the teachers in district A. The between-group consensus indices for citizens and teachers, citizens and school board members, teachers and school board members, public officials and school board members, citizens and public officials, and teachers and public officials in each district are reported in Table 3.4 and a summary of range, mean, standard deviation, and value ± 1.0 standard deviation from the mean for each pair of groups is reported in Table 3.5.

The Cochran Q test was applied to determine if there were significant differences between districts and Hoyt reliability coefficients were computed to assess the reliability of the measures. The results of these tests are summarized in Table 3.6. Differences significant at the .01 level were found for each of the six measures of between-group consensus. The Hoyt reliability coefficients for the measure of consensus between citizens and teachers was .649; between citizens and school board members, .726; between teachers and school board members, .677; between public officials and school board members, .601; between citizens and public officials, .835; and between teachers and public officials, .750.

TABLE 3.4

BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES BETWEEN CITIZENS, TEACHERS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT

District	Citizens-Teachers	Citizens-Boards	Teachers-Boards	Officials-Boards	Citizens-Officials	Teachers Officials
A	30	9	9	8	17	17
B	25	21	22	10	13	10
C	34	8	10	7	28	18
D	31	19	18	14	28	24
E	23	20	21	13	19	13
F	34	18	18	10	19	14
G	23	5	10	6	32	20
H	37	22	23	21	38	31
I	40	20	20	9	20	19
J	30	20	23	17	28	24
K	29	14	19	14	35	23
L	31	13	15	14	35	28

TABLE 3.5

RANGE, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND VALUES ONE STANDARD DEVIATION ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEAN OF THE BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES

Groups	Range		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean + 1 S.D.	Mean - 1 S.D.
	High	Low				
Citizens-Teachers	37	23	30.58	5.02	35.60	25.56
Citizens-Boards	22	5	15.75	5.54	21.29	10.21
Teachers-Boards	23	9	17.33	4.94	22.27	12.39
Officials-Boards	21	6	11.92	4.21	16.13	7.71
Citizens-Officials	38	13	26.00	7.84	33.84	18.16
Teachers-Officials	31	10	20.08	5.95	26.03	14.13

TABLE 3.6

COCHRAN Q VALUES AND HOYT RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES

Between-Group Indices	Cochran Q Values	Level of Significance*	Hoyt Reliability Coefficients
Citizens-Teachers	30.686	.01	.649
Citizens-Boards	38.981	.01	.726
Teachers-Boards	33.246	.01	.677
Officials-Boards	27.102	.01	.601
Citizens-Officials	62.849	.01	.835
Teachers-Officials	42.126	.01	.750

* $\chi^2_{.99} = 24.72$ and $\chi^2_{.95} = 19.68$ with 11 degrees of freedom

The data concerning consensus in expectations permitted the identification of high consensus and low consensus districts on both within- and between-group consensus of the four reference groups. A summary of the number of times each district ranked high, medium or low on each of the within- and between-group consensus indices is reported in Table 3.7. Eight districts had at least one high consensus score; seven districts had at least one low consensus score; and one district had neither a high nor a low consensus score. Four districts ranked high on some consensus scores and low on others.

An analysis was made of some general and some specific expectations concerning the school board role held by the four reference groups. A monograph summarizing the results of this analysis appears in this report as Appendix E.

TABLE 3.7

NUMBER OF HIGH, MEDIUM, AND LOW WITHIN- AND BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES FOR EACH OF THE 12 DISTRICTS

District	Within-Group Consensus			Between-Group Consensus			Totals		
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
A	0	3	1	0	3	3	0	6	4
B	1	2	1	0	3	3	1	5	4
C	0	3	1	0	3	3	0	6	4
D	0	4	0	0	6	0	0	10	0
E	1	1	2	0	4	2	1	5	4
F	1	2	1	0	5	1	1	7	2
G	0	2	2	0	2	4	0	4	6
H	4	0	0	6	0	0	10	0	0
I	1	3	0	1	5	0	2	8	0
J	1	2	1	2	4	0	3	6	1
K	1	3	0	1	5	0	2	8	0
L	2	2	0	2	4	0	4	6	0
Totals	12	27	9	12	44	16	24	71	25

Consensus Patterns

The data concerning consensus were analyzed to determine whether or not systematic differences could be attributed to the criteria which were employed in selecting districts to participate in the study. The influence on consensus patterns of the groups of questions regarding certain functional areas, and of specific questions, was also examined.

Selection Criteria and Consensus Patterns. The selection criteria which were used to select school districts for participation in the project were designed to provide a balanced distribution of school districts which were high, medium, and low on the criteria of size, wealth, ratio of non-public to total enrollment, intensity of community controversy, and fiscal independence-fiscal dependence. An analysis of variance was employed to test for significant differences in the consensus in expectations indices of school districts which were high, medium, and low on the selection criteria. The results of these tests are shown in Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES ACCORDING TO SELECTION CRITERIA

Selection Criterion	F Ratios			
	Citizens	Officials	Board	Teachers
Size	.185	1.578	.584	2.189
Wealth	1.634	.029	.074	.771
Non-Public/Total Enrollment	5.585*	2.084	.377	.250
Fiscal Control**	4.785	.681	.002	.004
Intensity of Community Issues	.561	.975	1.41	.123

*Significant at .05 level
**d.f. = 1,10; for all other categories d.f. = 2,9.

A difference significant at the .05 level was found in the within-group consensus indices for citizens on the criterion of ratio of non-public to total school enrollment. The data revealed that citizens in districts which had a medium ratio of non-public to total enrollment had more within-group consensus than did citizens in districts where the ratio of non-public enrollment was either high or low. The mean consensus index for the districts having a medium ratio of non-public enrollment was 57.25; the mean consensus indices for citizens in districts which had high and low non-public enrollment ratios were 47.33 and 46.80, respectively. In all other cases, the computed F ratios were not significant at the .05 level and the null hypothesis that there was no difference in within-group consensus in districts high, medium, and low on the selection criteria was accepted.

A similar analysis was performed to test for significant differences in the between-group consensus in expectations indices. The results of these tests are shown in Table 3.9. A difference significant at the .05 level was found in the degree of consensus between public officials and school board members for districts in which there was high, medium, or low intensity of community controversy. In all other cases the computed F ratio was not significant at the .05 level. Thus, it may be concluded that, in general, the selection criteria were not related to the degree of consensus in expectations within and between groups. The two exceptions involved (1) the within-group consensus of citizens and the ratio of non-public to total enrollment and (2) the between-group consensus of officials and board members and the intensity of community controversy.

TABLE 3.9

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS INDICES ACCORDING TO SELECTION CRITERIA

	F Ratios					
Selection Criterion	Citizens-Teachers	Citizens-Boards	Teachers-Boards	Officials-Boards	Citizens-Officials	Teachers-Officials
Size	.893	.732	.715	1.704	.905	1.008
Wealth	3.501	.187	.196	.073	.054	.022
Non-Public/ Total Enrollment	.520	.191	.648	1.257	2.171	.118
Fiscal** Control	1.256	.068	0.000	.071	.074	.172
Community Issues	1.223	.937	2.797	5.09*	.709	.563

*Significant at .05 level
**d.f. = 1,10; for all other categories d.f. = 2,9.

Type of Question and Consensus Patterns. The question of whether or not there was greater consensus in expectations on questions regarding certain functional areas of school operation also was examined. The number of times each group, or a pair of groups, had consensus on a question was recorded and the number of times a question evoked consensus within or between groups was tabulated.

Questions were classified according to whether they dealt with the image of the board, educational program, pupil personnel policies, staff personnel policies, business management policies, or unclassified (current) issues. Those questions that dealt with business management policies (including questions concerning school buildings and sites for new schools) produced the highest amount of within-group consensus per question, with an average of 6.4 districts having consensus in each group (See Table 3.10). Questions involving the image of the board evoked the next highest amount of consensus, with an average of 5.9 districts indicating consensus on such questions. The least consensus was found in responses to the questions concerning current issues, where an average of only 3.3 districts had consensus.

TABLE 3.10

NUMBER OF TIMES WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS WAS FOUND PER QUESTION AND PER QUESTION PER GROUP, ACCORDING TO TYPE OF QUESTIONS

Type of Question by Functional Area	No. of Questions	No. of Times Consensus Was Found	No. of Times Consensus Found Per Question	No. of Times Consensus Found Per Question Per Group[a]
Educational Program	13	283	21.8	5.5
Pupil Personnel	16	272	17.0	4.3
Staff Personnel	18	391	21.7	5.4
Board Image	20	473	23.6	5.9
Business Management	13	330	25.4	6.4
Unclassified	4	53	13.2	3.3
Total	84	1802	21.4	5.4

[a] Computed as number of times consensus found per question divided by number of reference groups (4).

An analysis of variance was performed to test for significant differences in the mean number of times consensus was found for the various types of questions. Types of questions were arranged over columns and the F ratio was found to be 1.67. Since a critical value of 2.33 was required for significance at the .05 level, it was concluded that there were no significant differences in the amount of within-group consensus found in responses to the various types of questions.

The amount of between-group consensus found in the responses to the various types of questions was studied similarly. No significant differences were found. A summary of the comparisons of between-group consensus on questions classified according to functional area is reported in Table 3.11.

On the basis of the above analyses, it was concluded that no significant differences in the amount of consensus in expectations for the school board role could be attributed to various types of questions; however, this analysis involved only the consensus found over all districts, not individual district differences in consensus.

TABLE 3.11

NUMBER OF TIMES BETWEEN-GROUP CONSENSUS WAS FOUND PER QUESTION AND PER COMPARISON, ACCORDING TO TYPE OF QUESTION

Type of Question by Functional Area	No. of Questions	No. of Times Consensus Found	No. of Times Consensus Found Per Question	No. of Times Consensus Found Per Question Per Comparison[a]
Educational Program	13	224	17.2	2.9
Pupil Personnel	16	182	11.4	1.9
Staff Personnel	18	368	20.4	3.4
Board Image	20	356	17.8	3.0
Business Management	13	312	24.0	4.0
Unclassified	4	18	4.5	.8
Totals	84	1460	17.4	2.9

[a] Computed as number of times consensus found per question divided by number of reference groups (6).

Individual Questions and Consensus Patterns. The contribution of individual questions to the consensus measures was studied with two points in mind: (1) were there questions which did not contribute to either within- or between-group consensus?, and (2) were there questions which did not contribute to the differentiation of degree of consensus between districts because there was complete agreement on the part of all groups in all districts? For one question no within-group consensus on the part of citizens was found in any district, but this question did produce consensus within the groups composed of public officials, school board members, and teachers. All other questions elicited within-group consensus concerning that question in one or more districts. Therefore, it was concluded that all questions contributed to some measure of consensus.

There was one question on which all reference groups in all districts had consensus; all other questions had 11 or fewer districts with within-board consensus. Further analysis revealed that on this particular question only four districts had within-citizen consensus, only seven districts had within-official consensus, and eleven districts had within-teacher consensus. Therefore, it was concluded that no question failed to differentiate in some manner the degree of within-group consensus among districts.

Examination of the data indicated that seven questions (See Appendix A, questions 35,66,67,70,80,93, and 97) did not contribute to the between-group consensus measures. Three of these questions concerned staff personnel policies, two concerned pupil personnel policies, one concerned business management policies, and one concerned board image.

The individual questions were examined to determine which of them elicited the greatest amount of consensus in expectations for the school board role. Questions on which there was the greatest amount of consensus within- and between-groups were:

> The school board should hold a hearing when a teacher who has been dismissed asks for it.
>
> The school board should require teachers to continue taking additional college work every so often.
>
> In preparing a budget, is it a good idea, or not, to ask teachers to recommend items which they think should be included?
>
> New school buildings should include facilities for the latest educational practices such as team teaching and language laboratories.

> Do you think the school board, school superintendent, or the teachers should take the most important part in deciding how the selection for sites of new schools should be done?
>
> Pupils should be permitted to give gifts to teachers that cost more than one dollar.
>
> Do you feel it's a good idea, or not, to include courses in public high school which deal with sex education?
>
> In addition to the usual report card, do you think that teachers should have personal conferences with the parents of pupils in their classes, or isn't this necessary?
>
> The school should be allowed to decide the proper dress and grooming of pupils.
>
> In your opinion, is it a good idea--or not really necessary--for the school board to let people know beforehand the items which will be covered at the next school board meeting?

The questions also were examined to identify those which elicited the least consensus. The questions on which there was the least consensus included the following:

> In your opinion, should your local school emphasize vocational subjects most, or should college preparation courses have the most emphasis?
>
> The school board should try to hire teachers so that a variety of political, economic and religious beliefs are represented on the faculty.
>
> Should teachers in your district be expected to participate in various community activities?
>
> Should fund drives within the schools be permitted, or not?
>
> Do you think it is a good idea, or not, for the school board to have citizens' committees to advise the board on ways to solve problems facing the schools?
>
> The school board should give leaves of absence with partial pay to allow teachers to take additional college work if the teachers agree to return to the local school district.

> Should your teachers be required to get the permission of the school board before they accept outside employment during the school year?

It was possible for two reference groups within a district to have within-group consensus, but to hold opposing expectations. This occurred 16 times between citizens and teachers, eight times between citizens and the school board, once between officials and the school board, and eight times between teachers and officials. (See Table 3.12.) The 33 occurrences of within-group consensus, but with opposing expectations, involved 24 questions on which two or more reference groups within one of the 12 districts held opposing expectations. However, there were only 11 different questions involved. One of these, Question 91, which asked if the respondent would be in favor of a rule that each pupil's IQ be reported to the pupil's parents, accounted for 13 of the 33 disagreements. There were 14 cases of disagreement on board image questions, 12 of which involved questions asking whose primary responsibility it was to perform certain tasks usually encountered in the operation of schools. Among other questions which evoked opposite within-group consensus was the question, "Should members of your school board be paid a salary?" In one district there were two cases of disagreement on this question, with the school board believing that board members should not be paid a salary and public officials and teachers believing that board members should be paid a salary.

TABLE 3.12

NUMBER OF TIMES AND THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED WHEN TWO GROUPS HAD WITHIN-GROUP CONSENSUS IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS

District	No. of Disagreements Between Groups	No. of Questions Involved	Questions Involved[a]
A	2	2	35I, 91
B	1	1	91
C	2	2	35J, 99
D	1	1	35K
E	6	4	35A(2), 35J, 35K, 91(2)
F	4	2	35A(2), 91(2)
G	2	1	91(2)
H	4	3	19(2), 35I, 91
I	3	3	31, 35J, 35K
J	4	3	57, 91(2), 94
K	4	2	85(2), 91(2)
L	0	0	85(2), 91(2)

[a] Number in parentheses indicate number of comparisons of groups where within-group consensus, but in opposite directions, existed.

The relatively low number of questions on which disagreement was found indicated that rather than areas of disagreement there were degrees of consensus on specific expectations for the school board role. In only a relatively small number of questions was within-group consensus involving conflicting expectations identified.

Summary. The findings relative to the degree of consensus within and between groups of citizens, teachers, school board members and elected public officials were helpful in identifying the interstitial position of the school board. Citizens exhibited a greater degree of within-group consensus in expectations for the school board role than did teachers, public officials, or school board members. The mean consensus index for citizens in the 12 districts was 54.58, while teachers had a mean consensus index of 42.00, officials had a mean consensus index of 31.33, and school board members had a mean consensus index of 22.25. Apparently the members of the school board, perhaps because of the board's interstitial position between the external and internal segments of the school organization, had the least amount of within-group consensus with regard to their expectations for their own role.

The groups composed of teachers had the smallest overall variation among their within-group consensus indices. This finding suggests that teacher groups were more alike than other groups in regard to their expectations for the school board role. Groups composed of public officials, on the other hand, exhibited the greatest amount of variation among the 12 districts on their within-group consensus indices. The standard deviation of the public official within-group consensus indices was 9.61, compared to a standard deviation of 4.34 for the teacher groups.

Analysis of the between-group consensus indices revealed that citizens and teachers were highest in the degree of between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role. The three between-group consensus indices involving the school board, i.e., the consensus between teachers and board members, citizens and board members, and officials and board members, were the lowest of the between-group consensus indices. The low consensus between the school board and other groups may have been due, in part, to the necessity of having within-group consensus on an item before it was possible to have between-group consensus on that item. Hence, school boards, which were low on within-group consensus, were limited in the amount of between-group consensus to which they could be a party. There was greater consensus between board members and teachers than between board members and citizens. School board members apparently were more similar to teacher groups than to citizen groups in their expectations for the school board role.

Regarding whether or not questions concerning certain functional areas of school operation evoked greater consensus than others, it was found that questions concerning business management policies (including school site and school building construction questions) evoked the greatest amount of consensus per question. The questions involving current issues, which included questions regarding federal aid to education and questions regarding transportation of parochial school pupils at public expense, evoked the least amount of consensus per question.

Analysis of the instances when two groups had within-group consensus, but held conflicting expectations, revealed that a major disagreement between groups involved whether or not a pupil's IQ should be reported to his parents. There was also considerable disagreement concerning the role of the school board with regard to specific tasks which are performed in the operation of a school district. It was apparent that the specific tasks in which the school board should be involved were not always clear to the sub-publics of the school organization.

The interrelationships between the within- and between-group consensus indices revealed that the degree of consensus within any group was not significantly related to the degree of consensus within any other group. The consensus within the citizen group was significantly related to the ratio of non-public school enrollment to total school enrollment. Those districts which had a high or a low ratio of non-public to total school enrollment had less consensus in expectations for the school board role within the citizen group than did other districts. The degree of consensus between school board members and public officials was significantly related to the intensity of community controversy. Districts rated medium in intensity of community controversy had the highest index of consensus between these two groups. Apparently, school districts which avoided the extremes of conflict or apathy were able to maintain a higher degree of consensus between school board members and public officials on expectations for the school board role than other districts.

General Consensus in Expectations and Financial Support

To determine whether or not a systematic relationship existed between consensus in expectations for the school board role and financial support of the schools, rank order correlations based upon data for all 12 districts were computed and analyses of variance were performed using districts which were high and low with respect to consensus in expectations. Four criteria of financial support were employed: (1) total school tax rate; (2) school tax rate for current operation (based on the actual equalized valuation of the district); (3) required levy rate for current operation (based upon the state guaranteed valuation of the district); and (4) local tax effort per pupil (local tax levy divided by average daily membership). Data concerning these four criteria of financial support were obtained for the school years 1963-64, 1964-65, and 1965-66. In addition, changes in financial support over the time span 1963-64 to 1965-66 were computed. Districts were rank ordered from high to low on each of the four financial support criteria and upon each of the various measures of within- and between-group consensus. Rank order correlations were then computed. In any case where there were more than four tied ranks, product-moment correlation coefficients were substituted for the rank order correlations.

In Table 3.13 are summarized the correlations between the four criteria of financial support for the 1963-64 school year and consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between various reference groups. No correlations significant at the .05 level were obtained for the first criterion of financial support, i.e., total school tax rate. Six of the 10 correlations relating to total school tax rate were inversely related to within- or between-group consensus.

A rank order correlation significant at the .05 level was found between school tax rate for current operation and within-group consensus on the part of citizens. No other correlation significant at the .05 level was obtained between this criterion of financial support and either within- or between-group consensus. In eight of the 10 correlations, ranking on school tax rate for current operation was inversely related, though not at a statistically significant level, to ranking on within- or between-group consensus.

The correlation between rank order on within-group consensus in expectations of citizens and required levy rate for current operation was significant at the .05 level. In addition, the correlation between rank on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and this financial support criterion was significant at the .01 level. No other statistically significant correlations were found between rank on required levy rate for current operation and rank on within- or between-group consensus measures.

No statistically significant correlations were found between local tax effort per pupil in average daily membership and any of the within- or between-group consensus measures. However, correlation between rank on this criterion and rank on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers approached significance.

In summary, the data reported in Table 3.13 revealed that only three of the 40 correlations which were computed were significant at or beyond the .05 level. Two of the significant correlations involved within-group consensus on the part of citizens; one involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers.

TABLE 3.13

CORRELATIONS--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1963-64, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	.404	.533*	.610*	.152
Public Officials	-.108	-.234	-.451	.000
School Boards	-.390	-.274	-.117	.138
Teachers[a]	-.248	-.433	.248	.475
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.109	.028	.750**	.514
Citizens-School Boards	-.392	-.210	-.154	.056
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.124	-.092	.150	.092
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.317	-.240	-.258	-.113
Public Officials-Teachers	.360	-.184	.093	.065
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.393	-.302	-.299	.021

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

a = Pearson product-moment correlation computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

In Table 3.14 the correlations between the four financial support measures for the 1964-65 school year and consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between various reference groups are summarized. Ranking on total school tax rate was inversely correlated at the .05 level of significance with ranking on within-group consensus for the school boards and between-group consensus of citizens and school boards. In addition, ranking on total school tax rate was inversely correlated with ranking on between-group consensus of teachers and school boards and approached statistical significance. Again, a majority of the correlations between ranking on total school tax rate and ranking on within- and between-group consensus were negative.

A negative correlation significant at the .01 level was found between ranking on school tax rate for current operation and ranking on within-group consensus of teachers. A positive correlation, significant at the .05 level, was found between ranking on school tax rate for current operation and ranking on within-group consensus of citizens. Eight of the 10 correlations involving school tax rate for current operation were negative.

A correlation significant at the .01 level was found between ranking on required levy rate for current operation and between-group consensus of citizens and teachers. A correlation significant at the .05 level was found between this financial support criterion and within-group consensus on the part of citizens. A majority of the correlations between ranking on required levy rate for current operation and ranking on within- and between-group consensus were negative.

None of the correlations between ranking on local tax effort per pupil in average daily membership and within- and between-group consensus of the various reference groups were significant at the .05 level.

Of the 40 correlations reported in Table 3.14, only six were significant at or beyond the .05 level. Two of the statistically significant correlations involved within-group consensus on the part of citizens, one involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers, and one involved between-group consensus of citizens and school board. In the latter case, however, the relationship was inverse. Statistically significant inverse relationships also were found between within-group consensus of school boards and total school tax rate and within-group consensus of teachers and school tax rate for current operation.

Similar computations were made using data for the 1965-66 school year and are reported in Table 3.15. A negative correlation significant at the .05 level was found between ranking on total school tax rate and ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and school boards. Again, a majority of the correlations were negative.

TABLE 3.14

CORRELATIONS--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1964-65, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	.411	.526*	.635*	.005
Public Officials	-.021	-.266	-.353	.098
School Boards	-.526*	-.267	-.288	.044
Teachers[a]	-.213	-.709**	.333	.433
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.120	.011	.715**	.391
Citizens-School Boards	-.535*	-.120	-.238	-.042
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.194	-.117	-.208	.170
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.413	-.240	-.395	-.226
Public Officials-Teachers	-.030	-.173	-.128	.068
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.527	-.309	.018	.021

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

a = Pearson product-moment correlation computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

TABLE 3.15

CORRELATIONS--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	.463	.505	.687*	-.030
Public Officials	.021	-.115	-.273	.042
School Boards	-.491	-.281	-.114	.341
Teachers[a]	-.028	-.340	.326	.567
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.201	-.021	.796**	.468
Citizens-School Boards	-.517*	-.175	-.063	.161
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.198	.007	-.046	-.046
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.303	-.106	-.265	-.095
Public Officials-Teachers	-.023	-.047	-.009	-.002
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.475	-.250	-.278	.081

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

a = Pearson product-moment correlation computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

No statistically significant correlations were found between ranking on school tax rate for current operation and ranking on within- or between-group consensus of various reference groups.

A correlation significant at the .01 level was found between ranking on required levy rate for current operation and ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers. A correlation significant at the .05 level was found between this financial support criterion and ranking on within-group consensus of citizens.

As in the case of data for the school years 1963-64 and 1964-65, no significant correlations were found between ranking on local tax effort per pupil in ADM and ranking on either within- or between-group consensus. However, the correlation between this criterion and within-group consensus of teachers did approach significance.

Of the 40 correlations reported in Table 3.15, only three were statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level. Each of the three statistically significant correlations involved citizen consensus. One involved within-group consensus of citizens; one involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers; and one involved (inversely) between-group consensus of citizens and school boards.

Summary. The data presented in Tables 3.13, 3.14 and 3.15 summarized correlations between rankings on four criteria of financial support and rankings on within- and between-group consensus for three school years. Of the 120 correlations which were reported, only 12 were statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level. Of these 12 statistically significant correlations, five involved within-group consensus of citizens. It is worth noting that all rankings involving tax rates (financial support criteria 1, 2, and 3) produced positive correlations with rankings of within-group consensus of citizens; that five of these nine correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level; and that the correlations ranged from .404 to .687.

Five of the statistically significant relationships involved between-group consensus of citizens and other reference groups. Three involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers; two involved between-group consensus of citizens and school boards, where an inverse relationship was found.

Correlations between rankings on within-group consensus of public officials and rankings on the three financial support criteria involving tax rates were consistently negative, although none were statistically significant.

An unusual and unanticipated relationship involving within-group consensus of school boards and financial support was found. In every instance where ranking on financial support criteria involving tax rates and ranking on within-group consensus of school boards were correlated, a negative relationship was discovered. The correlations varied from -.114 to -.526. Apparantly, high within-group consensus on the part of the school boards was associated with low tax rates for schools.

Relationships between rankings on within-group consensus of teachers and rankings on the four financial support criteria varied widely. Six correlations involving school tax rates were negative; three were positive. One of the six negative correlations was significant at the .01 level. The correlations ranged from .333 to -.709.

No statistically significant correlations were found between rankings on local tax effort per pupil in average daily membership and rankings on any of the within- or between-group consensus measures. Apparently, there is no relationship between local tax effort per pupil and consensus in expectations for the school board role. One may speculate that this lack of relationship is a by-product of the strong equalizing effect of the Wisconsin State Support Program.

With two notable exceptions, rankings on between-group consensus of the various reference groups and rankings on the four financial support criteria were not related. Rankings on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and rankings on required levy rate for current operation were statistically significant at the .01 level for each of the three years studied. The correlations ranged from .715 to .796. Negative correlations significant at the .05 level were found between rankings on total school tax rate and between-group consensus of citizens and school boards in two of the three years under study. In fact, in every instance the correlations between ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and school boards and ranking on the three financial support criteria involving tax rates were negative.

Eight of the nine correlations involving rankings on between-group consensus of teachers and school boards and rankings on the financial support criteria involving tax rates were negative, although none were statistically significant. On the other hand, correlations involving rankings on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and rankings on the three financial support criteria involving tax rates were positive in eight out of nine cases and, as noted above, were statistically significant at the .01 level in three instances.

In summary, it appeared that rankings on financial support criteria involving tax rates were systematically related in a direct fashion to rankings on within-group consensus in expectations for the school board role on the part of citizens. Rankings on these financial support criteria showed a systematic inverse relationship to rankings on within-group consensus of the school board, although not at a statistically significant level. The school board's postulated interstitial position was not clearly apparent from these analyses, although this may be the result of the procedure employed in this study to identify consensus in expectations.

High and Low Consensus in Expectations and Financial Support

To further explore the relationship between consensus in expectations for the school board role and financial support of the schools, high consensus and low consensus districts were identified. High consensus districts were defined as those school districts whose consensus indices were more than one standard deviation above the mean of the consensus indices. Low consensus districts were defined as those districts whose consensus indices were more than one standard deviation below the mean. Analyses of variance were performed to test for the significance of differences on the financial support criteria between high consensus and low consensus districts. The districts in which various reference groups had high and low consensus within and between groups in expectations for the school board role are identified in Table 3.16. The number of high consensus districts for each measure varied from one to four, while the number of low consensus districts for each measure was either two or three. Analyses of variance were performed only for data for the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years, since these two years were closest in time to the point when the interviews upon which the consensus indices were based were conducted.

The results of the analyses of variance of the four financial support criteria for the 1964-65 school year in districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role are shown in Table 3.17, while the results of similar analyses of financial support data for the 1965-66 school year are presented in Table 3.18. No significant F values were found for any comparison of differences in financial support measures in districts having high and low consensus. Thus, the data summarized in Table 3.17 and 3.18 provide support for the conclusion that there is no relationship between consensus in expectations for the school board role and financial support of the schools.

TABLE 3.16

DISTRICTS IN WHICH VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS HAD HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN GROUPS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Consensus Index	High Consensus Districts[a]	Low Consensus Districts[b]
Within-Group Consensus		
Citizens	F,H	E,J
Public Officials	H,K,L	B,F
School Boards	B,E,H	A,C,G
Teachers	H,I,J,L	E,G
Between-Group Consensus		
Citizens-Teachers	H,I	B,E,G
Citizens-School Boards	H	A,C,G
Citizens-Public Officials	H,K,L	A,C,G
Public Officials-School Boards	H,J	C,G
Public Officials-Teachers	H,L	A,B
Teachers-School Boards	H,J	B,G,F

[a] Districts $\geq$ + 1.0 S.D. from the mean of the consensus index

[b] Districts $\geq$ - 1.0 S.D. from the mean of the consensus index

TABLE 3.17

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1964-65, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Value for Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	2.881	2.551	5.484	.384
Public Officials	.759	2.673	1.647	.798
School Boards	2.779	.351	1.985	.229
Teachers	.122	.296	1.300	.484
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers	.003	.104	2.123	1.822
Citizens-School Boards	.557	.195	.647	.037
Citizens-Public Officials	1.539	.370	.401	1.002
Public Officials-School Boards	3.634	.939	1.591	1.050
Public Officials-Teachers	.079	.646	.007	1.704
Teachers-School Boards	3.065	1.872	3.178	.255

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

TABLE 3.18

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Value for Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	4.025	2.866	7.425	.258
Public Officials	.770	2.225	1.090	.687
School Boards	2.563	.386	.266	.094
Teachers	.172	.078	.636	1.065
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers	.218	.067	2.887	2.533
Citizens-School Boards	2.232	.181	.000	.007
Citizens-Public Officials	.802	.119	.060	.640
Public Officials-School Boards	4.871	.836	.830	.338
Public Officials-Teachers	.002	.461	.040	2.575
Teachers-School Boards	5.120	1.797	.813	.111

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

It should be noted that because of the small number of cases, a relatively high F value was required for significance at the .05 level. Review of the data presented in Tables 3.17 and 3.18 revealed that within-group consensus on the part of citizens consistently produced rather high F values relative to the three financial support criteria involving school tax rates. This finding lends some support to the findings obtained using rank order correlation procedures which were reported above.

Consensus in Expectations and Change in Financial Support

The relationship between change in financial support over a period of time and consensus in expectations for the school board role also was studied. The change in financial support from the 1963-64 school year to the 1965-66 school year, expressed as a percentage, was computed for each of the four financial support criteria. The 12 districts were then rank ordered from high to low on the basis of the change in financial support which occurred during the period under study. These rankings were then correlated with rankings on within- and between-group consensus. Rank order correlations were computed unless there were more than four tied ranks, in which case product-moment correlations were computed.

The correlations between ranking on change in financial support from 1963-64 to 1965-66 and ranking on consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between various reference groups are shown in Table 3.19. Not one of the 40 correlations which were computed was significant at the .05 level. In fact, all correlations were low, with only two of the 40 exceeding ±.25. Thus, no relationship was discerned between change in financial support and consensus in expectations for the school board role.

Analyses of variance of change in financial support from the 1964-65 school year to the 1965-66 school year in districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role also were performed. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 3.20. With one exception, financial support in districts having high consensus within and between groups did not differ significantly from financial support in districts having low consensus within and between groups. The one exception was in the case of within-group consensus of teachers relative to total school tax rate, where it was found that the difference between change in total school tax rate in districts where teachers had high consensus in expectations, as opposed to districts where teachers had low consensus in expectations, was significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.19

CORRELATIONS--CHANGE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1963-64 TO 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	.047	.142	.009	-.145
Public Officials	.150	-.206	.056	.098
School Boards	-.219	.037	-.142	-.155
Teachers[a]	.447	.213	.085	.057
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.296	.137	-.077	.000
Citizens-School Boards	-.098	.178	-.017	-.189
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.085	-.230	-.039	.004
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	.021	.145	.233	.011
Public Officials-Teachers	.236	-.009	.082	-.023
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.214	.011	-.155	-.214

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

a = Pearson product-moment correlation computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.

TABLE 3.20

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--CHANGE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1964-65 TO 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Value for Financial Support Criterion			
	FS-1	FS-2	FS-3	FS-4
Within-Group Consensus				
Citizens	.251	9.662	5.987	2.204
Public Officials	.070	2.175	.882	1.035
School Boards	.438	.228	.170	.507
Teachers	13.047*	2.581	.421	1.449
Between-Group Consensus				
Citizens-Teachers	.565	.001	.437	.003
Citizens-School Boards	.010	.606	.023	.196
Citizens-Public Officials	.407	1.687	2.439	.015
Public Officials-School Boards	.047	2.706	.080	.512
Public Officials-Teachers	1.600	.050	.000	.655
Teachers-School Boards	.062	.165	.123	.398

Legend: Financial Support Criterion

FS-1 = Total school tax rate
FS-2 = School tax rate for current operation
FS-3 = Required levy rate for current operation
FS-4 = Local tax effort per pupil in ADM

* = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,4

Consensus in Expectations and Budget Allocation

To ascertain whether or not consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between various reference groups was systematically related to expenditures in various school budget categories, rank order correlations were computed and analyses of variance were performed. Twelve budget categories were identified for study and all measures were standardized by expressing them on the basis of expenditure per pupil in average daily membership. The 12 budget categories studied were: (1) salaries of professional staff; (2) salaries of clerical and secretarial workers; (3) textbooks, library books and periodicals; (4) instructional supplies; (5) total instructional cost; (6) salaries of custodians; (7) plant operation; (8) plant maintenance; (9) school lunch; (10) transportation; (11) capital outlay; and (12) debt service. Expenditures per pupil in ADM were computed for each school district in each budget category. Districts were then arrayed from high to low on each budget allocation criterion on the basis of the amount expended per pupil. Rankings on each budget allocation criterion were compared with rankings on within- and between-group consensus using the rank order correlation procedure. When more than four tied ranks occurred, product-moment correlations were computed in place of rank order correlations.

In Table 3.21 are presented correlations between ranking on 11 budget allocation criteria (data regarding expenditures for school lunch were not available in all districts for 1963-64) and ranking on consensus in expectations for the school board role. Of the 110 correlations reported in Table 3.21, 11 were significant at or beyond the .05 level. Four of them involved within-group consensus on the part of citizens. Ranking on within-group consensus of citizens was significantly correlated with rankings on salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, total instructional cost, and plant maintenance. Ranking on budget allocation for plant operation was negatively correlated at the .05 level of significance with within-group consensus of public officials and was positively correlated at the .05 level with within-group consensus of school board. Within-group consensus of teachers was significantly correlated at the .05 level with budget allocation for plant maintenance.

With regard to between-group consensus, three statistically significant correlations, one at the .05 level and two at the .01 level, were found between the budget allocation criteria and between-group consensus of citizens and teachers. The correlation of between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and salaries of professional staff was significant at the .01 level; salaries of clerical workers at the .05 level; and total instructional cost

TABLE 3.21

CORRELATIONS--BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1963-64, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Groups	Correlation With Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	.593*	.691*	.117	.019	.603*	.481	.044	.547*	NOT PROVIDED IN ALL DISTRICTS DURING 1963-64	-.316	.212	-.114
Public Officials	-.150	-.465	.010	-.171	-.133	.200	-.573*	-.143		-.227	-.224	-.476
School Boards	-.156	.138	.159	-.159	-.205	-.002	.624*	.114		.170	.348	.355
Teachers[a]	.340	.142	-.560	.064	.284	.270	.028	.674*		-.489	-.255	-.085
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.785**	.591*	-.253	.218	.778**	.264	.359	.514		-.313	.218	.049
Citizens-School Boards	-.070	.112	.189	-.259	-.213	.077	.441	.238		.028	.224	.301
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.046	-.353	.117	.000	.219	.251	-.389	-.088		-.396	-.194	-.442
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.247	-.444	-.018	-.515	-.367	-.046	-.004	-.217		.074	-.123	.261
Public Officials-Teachers	.079	-.411	-.030	.491	-.149	.111	-.393	.009		-.163	-.222	-.240
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.334	-.112	.137	-.186	-.355	.074	.619*	.446		.134	.112	.105

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical workers
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional Supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians

B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12= Debt services

a = Pearson product-moment correlations computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

at the .01 level. Only one other statistically significant correlation--between-group consensus of teachers and school board and plant operation--was found among the 66 correlations involving between-group consensus and budget allocation. It should be noted that three of the budget allocation criteria employed in this study were relatively fixed, i.e., transportation, capital outlay and debt service. The amount of money expended for each of these categories was, to a considerable extent, determined by previous decisions and/or by statutory requirements. For example, once a debt is incurred, the school board has no alternative but to pay principal and interest on that debt as it comes due. No statistically significant correlations were found between budget allocation for transportation, capital outlay, or debt service and within- or between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role.

Table 3.22 contains the correlations between rankings on 12 budget allocation categories for the 1964-65 school year and rankings on consensus in expectations for the school board role. Of the 120 correlations reported in Table 3.22, 16 were statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level. Ranking on within-group consensus of citizens was significantly correlated with rankings on salaries of clerical workers and total instructional cost. Ranking on within- group consensus of public officials was significantly correlated (negatively) with expenditures for plant operation. Ranking on within-group consensus of school boards was significantly correlated with expenditures for textbooks, library books and periodicals, and with expenditures for plant operation. Ranking on within-group consensus of teachers was significantly correlated at the .01 level with salaries of custodians.

Rankings based on between-group consensus involving citizens and teachers produced five statistically significant correlations, two of which were significant at or beyond the .01 level. Ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers was significantly correlated with salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, total instructional costs, salaries of custodians, and plant maintenance expenditures. Ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and school boards was significantly correlated with expenditures for textbooks, library books and periodicals. Ranking on between-group consensus of public officials and school boards was positively correlated at the .01 level with expenditures for textbooks, library books and periodicals and negatively correlated at the .05 level with expenditures for instructional supplies. Between-group consensus of public officials and teachers was significantly correlated at the .05 level with expenditures for school lunch. Finally, rankings on between-group consensus of teachers and school boards correlated at the .05 level of significance with expenditures for textbooks, library books and periodicals. Eight of the 16 significant correlations

TABLE 3.22

CORRELATIONS--BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1964-65, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Groups	Correlation With Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	.495	.593*	.019	.044	.523*	.498	-.061	.327	.061	-.386	-.047	-.124
Public Officials	-.133	-.395	.189	-.276	-.154	.367	-.587*	-.094	.430	-.140	-.101	-.091
School Boards	-.205	.110	.642*	-.170	-.194	-.047	.659*	.093	-.114	.201	.236	-.226
Teachers[a]	.312	.284	-.099	.043	.397	.723**	.106	.262	.376	-.134	-.355	-.426
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.954**	.619*	-.004	.077	.739**	.679*	.324	.669*	.268	-.394	-.169	-.014
Citizens-School Boards	-.175	.112	.608*	-.322	-.168	.147	.476	.168	.042	.021	.140	-.392
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.060	-.353	.311	-.102	.000	.353	-.424	.057	.438	-.141	.004	.018
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.243	-.367	.727**	-.695*	-.332	.247	.053	-.292	.243	.141	-.325	-.194
Public Officials-Teachers	.117	-.341	.222	-.260	.033	.432	-.400	.054	.558*	-.149	-.118	-.166
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.387	-.155	.664*	-.295	-.355	.074	.450	.183	.193	.172	.127	-.429

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical workers
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians

B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12= Debt service

a = Pearson product-moment correlations computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

involved citizens in either within- or between-group consensus measures. Again, no significant correlations were found between expenditures for transportation, capital outlay or debt service and consensus in expectations within or between groups.

Correlations between rank order on allocations to various budget categories during the school year 1965-66 and rank order on within- and between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role were computed and are reported in Table 3.23. Of the 120 correlations reported in Table 3.23, 11 were statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level. Three of the statistically significant correlations involved within-group consensus of citizens; specifically, within-group consensus of citizens correlated significantly with salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, and total instructional cost. Ranking on within-group consensus of public officials correlated negatively at the .05 level of significance with ranking on budget allocation for plant operation. Ranking on within-group consensus of teachers correlated at the .05 level with budget allocation for salaries of custodians and plant maintenance.

Five statistically significant correlations which involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers were discovered. The correlation of ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and rankings on salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, and total instructional cost each were significant at the .01 level. The correlations of ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and rankings on budget allocation for salaries of custodians and for capital outlay were significant at the .05 level. No other correlations involving between-group consensus of the various reference groups were statistically significant.

Summary. A total of 350 correlations were computed to test whether or not budget allocations for three school years--1963-64, 1964-65, and 1965-66--were significantly related to within- or between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role on the part of the various reference groups. Thirty-eight of the 350 correlations were significant at or beyond the .05 level. Nine of the statistically significant correlations involved within-group consensus of citizens. Rankings on salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, and total instructional cost each showed consistent significant positive correlations with ranking on within-group consensus of citizens.

Ranking on within-group consensus of public officials exhibited a consistent significant negative correlation with ranking on budget allocation for plant operation, the relationship being significant at the .05 level for each of the three years. Ranking on within-group consensus of public officials also was inversely correlated with rankings on other budget

TABLE 3.23

CORRELATIONS--BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	.547*	.579*	.061	.233	.589*	.505	.414	.299	.163	-.180	.495	.316
Public Officials	-.199	-.150	.057	-.308	-.248	.259	-.535*	.014	-.350	-.213	-.367	.000
School Boards	-.163	.107	.369	-.012	-.114	.037	.328	.040	.251	.023	.453	-.037
Teachers[a]	.241	.567	.043	-.305	.255	.702*	.057	.638*	-.326	-.397	.369	-.376
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.746**	.848**	.056	.134	.774**	.676*	.395	.415	-.014	.334	.641*	.165
Citizens-School Boards	-.126	.133	.413	-.161	-.119	.238	.203	.175	.070	-.077	.485	-.140
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	.011	.085	.237	-.124	-.053	.286	-.329	.071	-.251	-.164	-.258	.141
Public Officials-School Boards[a]	-.219	-.099	.208	-.519	-.275	.360	-.106	.268	-.321	-.039	.049	.032
Public Officials-Teachers	.093	-.002	.194	-.302	-.016	.425	-.421	.044	-.484	-.191	-.215	.005
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.366	-.063	.387	-.176	-.341	.155	.141	.112	-.039	.056	.337	-.239

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical workers
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians
B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12= Debt service

a = Pearson product-moment correlations computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

allocation criteria, although not at a statistically significant level, in 25 of the remaining 32 comparisons.

Three statistically significant correlations involving within-group consensus of school boards were found. Ranking on within-group consensus of the school boards was correlated with rankings on budget allocation for plant operation during the 1963-64 and 1964-65 school years; ranking on within-group consensus of school boards and ranking on budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals was statistically significant during the 1964-65 school year. No statistically significant correlations involving within-group consensus of school boards were found for the 1965-66 school year. Ranking on within-group consensus of school boards and rankings on budget allocation for salaries of professional staff and for total instructional cost were in every instance inversely correlated, though not at a statistically significant level.

Within-group consensus involving teachers produced four significant correlations, one of which was significant at the .01 level. In 1963-64, ranking of within-group consensus of teachers correlated significantly with budget allocation for plant maintenance; in 1964-65 ranking of within-group consensus of teachers correlated significantly with ranking on budget allocation for salaries of custodians; in 1965-66, ranking of within-group consensus of teachers correlated significantly with budget allocation for salaries of custodians and for plant maintenance. Perhaps of greater practical significance is the fact that ranking on within-group consensus of teachers did not correlate significantly with rankings on budget allocation for salaries of professional staff or for total instructional cost in any of the three years under study.

Between-group consensus of citizens and teachers accounted for 13 of the 38 statistically significant correlations which were identified. Ranking based on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers was correlated at the .01 level with budget allocation for salaries of professional staff and budget allocation for total instructional cost in each of the three years under study. The correlation between budget allocation for salaries of clerical workers and between-group consensus of citizens and teachers also was statistically significant during each of the three years, once at the .01 level and twice at the .05 level. During both 1964-65 and 1965-66, the relationship between ranking based on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and rankings on salaries of custodians was significant at the .05 level. In 1964-65, the relationship between ranking based on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and ranking on budget allocation for plant maintenance was statistically significant at the .05 level.

In 1965-66, the relationship between ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and ranking on budget allocation for capital outlay was statistically significant at the .05 level.

Only one statistically significant correlation involving between-group consensus of citizens and school board was discovered. This was for the 1964-65 school year, where ranking on between-group consensus of citizens and school boards and ranking on budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals was statistically significant at the .05 level.

No statistically significant correlations involving between-group consensus of citizens and public officials and the various budget allocation criteria were discovered. However, two significant correlations involving between-group consensus of public officials and school boards were found for the 1964-65 school year. These involved expenditures for textbooks, library books and periodicals, which was significant at the .01 level, and budget allocation for instructional supplies for which a negative correlation significant at the .05 level was found. Ranking on between-group consensus of public officials and teachers and rankings based on the various budget allocation criteria produced only one significant correlation. It involved budget allocation for school lunch during the 1964-65 school year.

Between-group consensus involving teachers and school boards produced two significant correlations. Ranking based on between-group consensus of teachers and school boards correlated significantly with ranking on budget allocation for plant operation in 1963-64 and with ranking on budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals during 1964-65. All correlations involving ranking on between-group consensus of teachers and school boards and rankings on budget allocation for salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, instructional supplies and total instructional costs were negative, although not at a statistically significant level.

High and Low Consensus in Expectations and Budget Allocation

To determine whether or not a relationship existed between expenditures in various budgetary categories and consensus in expectations for the school board role held by various reference groups, districts having high and low consensus in expectations were identified. As discussed previously, high consensus districts were defined as those more than one standard deviation above the mean of the consensus indices; low consensus districts were defined as those more than one standard deviation below the mean. Analyses of variance of the differences in allocation to the 12 budget criteria in high and low consensus districts were conducted. Only data on budget allocations for the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years were employed in the analyses of variance, since these two years most closely approximated the point in time at which the data used to determine consensus was obtained.

The results of the analyses of variance of differences in budget allocations in high and low consensus districts during the 1964-65 school year are shown in Table 3.24. Of the 120 F ratios which were obtained, six were significant at the .05 level and three were significant at the .01 level. No significant F ratios involving within-group consensus of citizens were obtained. The differences in budget allocation for school lunch in districts having high and low within-group consensus of public officials were significant at the .05 level. Differences in budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals in districts having high and low within-group consensus of school boards also were significant at the .05 level. Budget allocation for capital outlay in districts having high and low within-group consensus of teachers was significant at the .05 level.

Differences involving between-group consensus in high and low consensus districts produced six of the nine significant F ratios. Three of these involved between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and differences in budget allocation for salaries of custodians, for transportation, and for debt service. Between-group consensus of citizens and school boards in high and low consensus districts yielded an F ratio significant at the .05 level for budget allocation for salaries of custodians. High and low consensus on the part of public officials and school boards produced a difference significant at the .01 level in budget allocation for instructional supplies. High and low between-group consensus of teachers and school boards produced a difference significant at the .05 level in budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals.

The pattern found in the results of the analyses of variance did not conform to the pattern found in analysis based on rank correlations. Although several significant F ratios were identified, they did not, for the most part, occur in the same budget allocation categories as did the significant correlations which were discussed above. The lack of significant F ratios involving within-group consensus of citizens was striking. Although between-group consensus involving citizens and teachers accounted for three of the nine significant F ratios, they did not occur in the same categories as did the significant rank order correlations involving between-group consensus of citizens and teachers and the various budget allocation categories.

Analyses of variance were performed using comparable data for the 1965-66 school year and the resulting F ratios are reported in

TABLE 3.24

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--BUDGET ALLOCATIONS, 1964-65, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Value for Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	5.819	1.640	.000	.083	7.015	.958	.880	.392	.663	1.397	.018	.250
Public Officials	.005	.808	.003	.967	.002	2.742	6.260	.482	14.355[f]	7.453	1.216	1.092
School Boards	2.090	.245	9.050[a]	1.674	1.790	.391	1.845	.335	1.633	.059	.133	.321
Teachers	.549	.351	.002	.966	.508	1.469	.111	.018	2.534	1.896	20.178[h]	1.712
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers	2.890	2.889	.013	.080	3.046	17.058[d]	.000	2.059	6.741	57.675[g]	3.315	49.794[i]
Citizens-School Boards	.003	.002	13.247	.772	.000	43.429[e]	.056	.058	.576	.503	.001	.712
Citizens-Public Officials	.157	.911	.736	.000	.126	1.903	.077	.109	3.022	.001	.078	.173
Public Officials-School Boards	.860	.375	15.750	421.132[c]	1.043	.986	.088	1.733	1.303	.447	1.882	8.591
Public Officials-Teachers	.788	.389	.060	.254	.907	3.071	6.267	.025	6.895	9.294	1.246	.718
Teachers-School Boards	1.388	.532	20.538[b]	1.588	1.223	1.471	.426	.034	2.761	.000	.162	2.209

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical staff
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians
B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11 = Capital outlay
B-12 = Debt service

Significant values of F

a = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,4
b = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,3
c = Significant at .01 level, d.f. = 1,2
d = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,3
e = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,2
f = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,3
g = Significant at .01 level, d.f. = 1,3
h = Significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,4
i = Significant at .01 level, d.f. = 1,3

Table 3.25. Only four F ratios significant at the .05 level were found for differences in budget allocation between districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role. No significant F ratios were found for differences in the various budget allocation categories and high and low within-group consensus on the part of the four reference groups.

High and low between-group consensus of citizens and teachers yielded a significant F ratio for budget allocations for salaries of custodians and for transportation. High and low between-group consensus of citizens and school boards yielded a significant F ratio for differences in budget allocation to salaries of custodians. The fourth significant ratio involved between-group consensus of public officials and school boards and differences in budget allocation for instructional supplies.

On the basis of the analyses of variance of differences in allocations to 12 budget categories during the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years in districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between various reference groups, it was concluded that no systematic relationship could be identified. Failure to find systematic relationships may have been due in part to the small size of the groups involved, but the small F ratios which were obtained do not support the view that systematic relationships might have been identified if a larger sample had been employed.

Consensus in Expectations and Change in Budget Allocation

To ascertain whether or not changes in budget allocation were systematically related to consensus in expectations for the school board role, rank order correlations were computed and analyses of variance were performed. The change in allocations in each of the 12 budget categories from 1963-64 to 1965-66 was computed for each school district. The changes were expressed as percentages and the districts were arrayed from high to low on each of the 12 budget allocation criteria. Correlations were computed between the rank order of the districts on within- and between-group consensus for the various reference groups and rankings on change in each of the 12 budget allocation criteria. These correlations are reported in Table 3.26.

Only two of the 120 correlations were significant at or beyond the .05 level. The correlation between ranking on within-group consensus of public officials and ranking on change in budget allocation for salaries of clerical workers was significant at the .05 level. The ranking of districts on within-group consensus of teachers and their ranking on change in budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals was significant at the .01

TABLE 3.25

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Values for Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	3.155	4.837	.022	.011	5.690	1.811	.044	1.417	.700	.183	.986	1.468
Public Officials	.177	.029	.003	2.593	.000	3.470	5.735	.002	1.638	8.148	1.884	.217
School Boards	.939	.275	1.835	.795	.719	.397	.749	.107	.005	.027	.037	.067
Teachers	.290	.937	.058	7.477	.538	1.694	.572	1.005	1.722	1.030	1.303	.755
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers	2.638	5.612	.185	.378	4.006	11.345[b]	.012	5.125	2.749	23.716[d]	3.205	.374
Citizens-School Boards	.002	.012	2.115	.406	.077	22.910[c]	.050	13.141	.015	.311	.041	.176
Citizens-Public Officials	.121	.031	.045	.150	.459	3.139	.002	.031	.042	.010	.136	3.483
Public Officials-School Boards	.953	.105	.051	55.299[a]	.539	1.848	.073	.025	1.914	.310	.000	.708
Public Officials-Teachers	.216	.949	.119	2.960	.678	3.343	4.093	1.186	6.465	4.930	.644	.028
Teachers-School Boards	1.499	.175	.582	1.047	.671	2.172	.001	.148	1.001	.017	.129	.558

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical staff
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians
B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12= Debt service

Significant Values of F

a = significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,2
b = significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,3
c = significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,2
d = significant at .05 level, d.f. = 1,3

TABLE 3.26

CORRELATIONS--CHANGE IN BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1963-64 TO 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN VARIOUS REFERENCE GROUPS

Reference Group	Correlation With Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	-.156	-.012	.079	-.075	.065	-.061	.019	.019	.271	.104	.208	.418
Public Officials	-.437	.517*	.157	.024	-.028	-.056	.206	-.003	-.269	.353	-.066	.315
School Boards	.089	-.149	.201	.187	-.030	-.092	-.292	.247	-.033	-.028	.013	-.432
Teachers[a]	-.518	.482	.787**	-.305	-.206	.163	-.213	.255	-.057	.297	.468	.312
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers[a]	.191	.320	.524	-.268	.194	-.102	-.352	.099	-.141	-.071	.334	.113
Citizens-School Boards	-.042	-.189	.364	.112	-.154	.021	-.210	.378	.070	.161	.112	-.434
Citizens-Public Officials[a]	-.449	.368	.167	-.148	-.021	.201	.095	.060	-.286	.360	-.035	.406
Public Officials-School Board[a]	-.113	.243	.183	.219	.134	.483	-.053	.011	-.152	.222	.202	-.201
Public Officials-Teachers	-.407	.400	.337	-.194	-.002	.292	-.012	.093	-.302	.288	.135	.184
Teachers-School Boards[a]	-.271	-.151	.264	.056	-.292	.091	-.172	.232	-.018	.211	.158	-.443

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical workers
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost.
B-6 = Salaries of custodians
B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12= Debt service

a = Pearson product-moment computed because of tied ranks. All other correlations reported are rank order correlations.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level

level. No significant relationships involving ranking on within-group consensus of teachers or between-group consensus of citizens and teachers were identified for any of the 12 budget allocation criteria. Only 15 of the 120 correlations exceeded .400 and only 28 of them exceeded .300. On the basis of the correlations presented in Table 3.26, it was concluded that no systematic relationship existed between change in budget allocation and consensus in expectations for the school board role within and between the various reference groups.

Analyses of variance were performed to test for significant difference in budget allocation in the 12 budget allocation categories in districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role on the part of the various reference groups. The results of the analyses of variance are reported in Table 3.27.

Of the 120 F ratios reported in Table 3.27, only two were significant at or beyond the .05 level. The change in budget allocation for textbooks, library books and periodicals in districts having high and low within-group consensus on the part of teachers was significant at the .01 level. The change in budget allocation for plant maintenance in districts having high and low between-group consensus on the part of citizens and teachers was significant at the .05 level. Thus, the analyses of variance of change in budget allocations from 1964-65 to 1965-66 in districts having high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role on the part of various reference groups yielded no evidence of systematic relationships. It was concluded, that on the basis of the analyses of variance, there was no difference in budget allocation which could be attributed to high or low consensus in expectations for the school board role.

Resolution of Conflict

Data concerning the relative effectiveness in resolving conflict of each of the 12 school boards included in the study were obtained through observation of three consecutive school board meetings held during the period of time when the school district budget for the 1966-67 school year was being developed. However, all issues which were brought to a vote during the three board meetings were utilized to obtain conflict resolution scores. A team of three observers attended each board meeting. A record was kept of participation by board members in the discussion of each issue and of the vote on each issue. In addition, each observer independently rated the performance of the board on each issue. Each board member was requested to evaluate the intensity of each issue as he perceived

TABLE 3.27

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--CHANGE IN BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1964-65 TO 1965-66, AND CONSENSUS WITHIN AND BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW CONSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Reference Group	F Value for Budget Allocation Criterion											
	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	B-7	B-8	B-9	B-10	B-11	B-12
Within-Group Consensus												
Citizens	.091	.068	.018	.337	.012	.329	.906	.490	1.092	2.645	1.455	2.169
Public Officials	1.276	1.193	.761	.184	1.000	.093	.125	.729	5.349	.640	1.678	.879
School Boards	.607	.265	.405	.444	.024	.027	.674	1.367	.322	.000	.561	.842
Teachers	.717	.819	61.192[a]	.053	.003	2.552	.001	.440	.305	1.783	4.981	1.447
Between-Group Consensus												
Citizens-Teachers	1.697	.398	3.220	.102	.000	.022	.697	13.440[b]	.001	.337	.953	.004
Citizens-School Boards	1.050	.084	.987	.071	.000	.225	.760	2.775	.116	1.613	.288	.007
Citizens-Public Officials	2.042	.923	.004	.173	1.416	.129	.021	.094	4.701	.808	.104	2.192
Public Officials-School Boards	1.733	.058	1.726	.310	.057	9.258	1.957	.180	.481	.236	5.153	1.796
Public Officials-Teachers	1.654	3.859	2.758	.528	.043	.255	.100	3.276	.166	.720	.004	.331
Teachers-School Boards	3.646	.105	1.527	.020	.160	1.626	2.261	.162	.067	.405	2.200	.630

Legend: Budget Allocation Criterion (All based on per pupil in ADM)

B-1 = Salaries of professional staff
B-2 = Salaries of clerical workers
B-3 = Textbooks, library books & periodicals
B-4 = Instructional supplies
B-5 = Total instructional cost
B-6 = Salaries of custodians
B-7 = Plant operation
B-8 = Plant maintenance
B-9 = School lunch
B-10= Transportation
B-11= Capital outlay
B-12 = Debt services

Significant Values of F

a = Significant at .01 level, d.f.= 1,4
b = Significant at .05 level, d.f.= 1,3

it and to rate his personal satisfaction with the disposition of the issuesby the board. Four conflict resolution scores were computed for each board using the procedures described in Chapter II. The four boards which had the highest scores and the four boards which had the lowest scores on the four conflict resolution measures were identified and designated as high conflict resolution boards and low conflict resolution boards, respectively. The conflict resolution score and rank of each school board on each of the four measures of conflict resolution is shown in Table 3.28.

TABLE 3.28

CONFLICT RESOLUTION SCORE FOR EACH SCHOOL BOARD FOR FOUR MEASURES OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION*

School Board	Conflict Resolution Score and Rank			
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4
A	23.62 (5)	16.63 (6)	30.33 (4)	6.18 (4)
B	22.31 (11)	16.00 (11)	27.71 (9)	5.63 (11)
C	23.26 (7)	16.95 (4)	26.58 (18)	6.11 (6)
D	24.22 (2)	17.45 (3)	28.18 (8)	5.93 (8)
E	23.88 (3)	17.48 (2)	37.41 (1)	6.14 (5)
F	23.17 (8)	16.36 (10)	29.56 (6)	5.92 (9)
G	23.72 (4)	16.74 (5)	33.05 (2)	6.34 (2)
H	22.82 (10)	16.58 (7)	20.95 (11)	6.23 (3)
I	25.33 (1)	18.70 (1)	30.07 (5)	6.82 (1)
J	23.51 (6)	16.53 (8)	28.66 (7)	6.09 (7)
K	20.11 (12)	13.52 (12)	20.35 (12)	4.18 (12)
L	23.01 (9)	16.48 (9)	32.23 (3)	5.73 (10)

*Supra, pp. 32-33.
Rank 1, 2, 3 and 4 = High conflict resolution school board
Rank 9, 10, 11 and 12 = Low conflict resolution school board

The conflict resolution scores of the 12 school boards ranged from 20.11 to 25.33 on measure 1; from 13.52 to 18.70 on measure 2; from 20.35 to 37.41 on measure 3; and from 4.18 to 6.82 on measure 4. The various methods of computing conflict resolution did produce some variation in the rankings of the 12 districts. However, three boards (E,G and I) ranked among the top four school boards on three of the four conflict resolution measures. Two of them (B and K) ranked among the bottom four school boards on each of the four conflict resolution measures and one (L) ranked among the bottom four boards on three of the four measures.

The mean intensity of issues, as evaluated by the members of each board, was an important component in three of the four conflict resolution measures. The mean intensity score of each of the 12 school boards, the ranking of each board, and the number of issues acted upon by each board is shown in Table 3.29. The mean intensity scores ranged from 3.34 for Board H to 6.04 for Board E, while the number of issues acted upon ranged from seven for Board I to 24 for Board H. Rank order correlations between rank on mean intensity of issues and rank on each of the four conflict resolution measures were computed. The rank order correlation with measure 1 was .038; with measure 2, -.150; with measure 3, .696; and with measure 4, -.238. Only the correlation of rank order on mean intensity of issues and rank order on conflict resolution measure 3 was significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.29

MEAN INTENSITY SCORE, RANK AND NUMBER OF ISSUES ACTED UPON BY EACH OF THE 12 SCHOOL BOARDS

School Board	Mean Intensity Score	Rank	Number of Issues
A	4.85	4	18
B	4.72	7	18
C	4.34	11	17
D	4.66	8	16
E	6.04	1	9
F	4.81	5	13
G	5.18	3	23
H	3.34	12	24
I	4.36	10	7
J	4.52	9	14
K	4.81	5	10
L	5.40	2	18

The nature of the issues upon which the 12 school boards took action also was tabulated. The results of the tabulation are shown in Table 3.30. Over 68 percent of their actions involved issues related to school plant, staff personnel or finance. Only 7 percent of their actions involved issues related to the instructional program.

TABLE 3.30

TYPES OF ISSUES UPON WHICH THE 12 SCHOOL BOARDS TOOK ACTION

Type of Issue	No. of Issues	Percent of Issues
School Plant	44	23.5
Staff Personnel	43	23.0
Finance	41	21.9
Pupil Personnel	28	15.0
Instructional Program	13	7.0
Unclassified	18	9.6
Total	187	100.0

Resolution of Conflict and Financial Support

Analyses of variance were employed to determine whether or not differences on four measures of financial support could be attributed to the school board's conflict resolution score. The F values obtained for each analysis using data on financial support for the 1965-66 school year are reported in Table 3.31. Data for the 1965-66 school year were employed since they most closely approximated the point in time at which conflict resolution was measured. No F values significant at the .05 level were obtained. Thus, it was concluded that there was no relationship between financial support and the school board's score on conflict resolution using the four criteria of conflict resolution which were employed in this study.

TABLE 3.31

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1965-66, IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW SCORES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION USING FOUR METHODS FOR MEASURING CONFLICT RESOLUTION BY THE SCHOOL BOARD

Financial Support Criterion	F Value for Conflict Resolution Measure			
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4
Total school tax rate	.811	2.752	.540	2.698
School tax rate for current operation	.139	2.307	.693	1.580
Required levy rate for current operation	.361	.550	.809	.177
Local tax effort per pupil in ADM	.155	1.496	.007	.359

For all F values d.f. = 1,6.

Analyses of variance also were employed to determine whether or not change in financial support from the 1964-65 to the 1965-66 school year could be attributed to the school board's conflict resolution score. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 3.32. Again, no significant F values were obtained for any measure of conflict resolution in relation to the four criteria of financial support employed in this study. It was concluded that change in financial support was not related to the school board's conflict resolution score as measured in this study.

TABLE 3.32

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--CHANGE IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT, 1964-65 TO 1965-66, IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW SCORES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION USING FOUR METHODS FOR MEASURING CONFLICT RESOLUTION BY THE SCHOOL BOARD

Financial Support Criterion	F Value for Conflict Resolution Measure			
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4
Total school tax rate	2.801	.005	1.181	.015
School tax rate for current operation	2.402	2.626	.064	.715
Required levy rate for current operation	5.909	4.263	1.307	3.046
Local tax effort per pupil in ADM	2.072	.903	.976	.280

For all F values d.f. = 1,6.

Resolution of Conflict and Budget Allocation

Using data on budget allocation in 12 budget categories for the 1965-66 school year, analyses of variance were employed to determine whether or not a school board's conflict resolution score was related to budget allocation. The F values for the 48 comparisons are reported in Table 3.33. It was found that in only one instance--conflict resolution as measured by conflict resolution measure 1 and budget allocation for instructional supplies--was an F value significant at the .05 level obtained. The budget allocation for instructional supplies in districts where the school board rated high in conflict resolution differed significantly from the budget allocation for instructional supplies in school districts where the board rated low in conflict resolution. In no other comparison was an F value significant at the .05 level obtained. Thus, it was concluded that budget allocation was not related to the school board's resolution of conflict as measured in this study.

TABLE 3.33

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1965-66, IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW SCORES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION USING FOUR METHODS FOR MEASURING CONFLICT RESOLUTION BY THE SCHOOL BOARD

Budget Allocation Criterion[a]	F Value for Conflict Resolution Measure			
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4
Salaries of professional staff	1.039	.975	.258	.486
Salaries of clerical workers	.584	3.008	.183	1.417
Textbooks, library books & periodicals	.103	4.386	2.340	.772
Instructional supplies	8.865*	3.419	.040	.916
Total instructional cost	1.122	1.521	.144	.849
Salaries of custodians	.004	.201	2.175	.839
Plant operation	.135	.565	2.086	4.228
Plant maintenance	.062	.448	1.514	2.219
School lunch	.302	.948	.278	.053
Transportation	.001	1.045	.061	4.314
Capital outlay	.377	.205	1.516	.654
Debt service	.119	.173	.152	1.442

[a] All measures based on expenditure per pupil in ADM

* = Significant at .05 level (For all F values, d.f. = 1,6)

To determine whether change in budget allocations from the 1964-65 to the 1965-66 school year was related significantly to the school board's conflict resolution score, analyses of variance were again utilized. The 48 F values obtained for the various comparisons are shown in Table 3.34. Five of the 48 analyses of variance yielded F ratios which were significant at the .05 level. It was found that budget allocation for salaries of custodians differed significantly between districts whose boards rated high and districts whose boards rated low in conflict resolution measures 1, 2 and 4. The school boards rated high and low on conflict resolution measure 2 were found to have significantly different budget allocations for school lunch and for transportation. However, no significant differences were identified for those budget allocation criteria which related directly to the educational program, e.g., salaries of professional staff and total instructional cost. The data presented in Table 3.34 support the conclusion that there was no relationship between changes in budget allocation and high and low scores on conflict resolution by the school boards.

TABLE 3.34

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE--CHANGE IN BUDGET ALLOCATION, 1964-65 TO 1965-66, IN DISTRICTS HAVING HIGH AND LOW SCORES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION USING FOUR METHODS FOR MEASURING CONFLICT RESOLUTION BY THE SCHOOL BOARD

Budget Allocation Criterion[a]	F Value for Conflict Resolution Measure			
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4
Salaries of professional staff	.040	.099	.209	4.255
Salaries of clerical workers	.301	.201	.077	.005
Textbooks, library books & periodicals	1.683	.143	1.199	.147
Instructional supplies	.386	.104	.821	.369
Total instructional cost	.072	1.714	.029	1.304
Salaries of custodians	7.716*	9.929*	.986	8.980*
Plant operation	3.284	2.102	4.343	1.948
Plant maintenance	.006	.020	.026	3.411
School lunch	3.712	6.360*	.052	.893
Transportation	5.414	7.612*	1.350	1.464
Capital outlay	1.633	3.021	.732	1.364
Debt service	.467	1.681	.828	.575

a = All measures based on expenditure per pupil in ADM
* = Significant at .05 level (For all F values d.f. = 1,6)

CHAPTER IV

INVESTIGATIONS TANGENTIAL TO THE RESEARCH PROJECT

A number of doctoral dissertations tangential to the major research project have been completed or are underway. A tangential investigation is defined as one that is dependent upon the project for at least some of its basic data but involves (1) additional data or (2) analyses of project data which were not made in testing the basic hypotheses of the major research project. These tangential studies extended the research project's range of variables among which relationships could be studied. Each of the doctoral investigations was carried out by a research assistant or by some other advanced graduate student who was associated with the research project. These students participated actively in the planning of the major project and in the gathering of the basic data utilized by it. The tangential studies were planned to explore problems which were important not only in their own right, but also in terms of clarifying relationships which might be useful in interpreting the findings of the major research project. A broad range of interests and topics were encompassed by the tangential investigations which have been conducted, including relationships of expectations for the role of the school board to (1) school district innovativeness, (2) to selected educational finance variables, (3) and to such socio-economic variables of school board members as level of education, family income, religious orientation, and political party affiliation; differences in expectations and satisfaction of effective and ineffective school board members; relationship of consensus in expectations and conflict resolution by school boards; newspaper reporting of educational conflicts in school and community; relationships of personal characteristics of school board members to their reactions to issues confronting the board; and relationships of school board members' values and belief systems to their satisfaction with the school board role. Each tangential study utilized a research design uniquely fitted to its purposes and depended upon the major research project only for relevant data. The purposes, methodology, and findings of each of the studies are reviewed briefly in this chapter.

Expectations for the School Board Role and Selected Financial Variables

Thorson[1] examined the relationships, in the 12 school districts included in the major research project, of the level of expectations held by citizens, teachers, public officials, and school board members for the financial aspects of the school board role to (1) the level of local financial support for the schools and (2) the amount of funds allocated for selected categories of expenditures. Also, the relationship between general expectations for the school board role and financial support, and the relationship between level of satisfaction with certain phases of the school program and financial support were studied.

The rationale for this investigation stemmed from role theory concerning conflict in expectations, and from research concerning the interstitial position of the school board in society. The relationships between expectations of society (both intra- and extra-organizational groups) and the procurement and allocation functions of the school board provided the bases for the hypotheses tested.

The data concerning the expectations for the school board role were obtained from the interview instrument employed in the basic research project. Thorson selected questionnaire items relating to the financial aspects of the school board role. The data for these items were quantified and the internal consistency tested by means of the RAVE[2] program which used reciprocal averages for scaling questionnaires. This program makes it possible to quantify qualitative data. The financial support data utilized in this investigation related to four measures of local financial effort to support the schools and 10 budget classifications of expenditures. Data regarding level of financial support were standardized in terms of district equalized valuation of real property and the budget allocations data were standardized on the basis of average daily pupil membership or number of certificated staff members. Non-parametric statistical techniques were employed. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to determine whether significant relationships existed between variables.

Of the 16 tests of the hypothesis concerning the relationship between the level of expectations for the financial aspects of the school board and the level of local financial support only one was significant at the .05 level. A negative relationship was found to exist between teachers' expectations for level of expenditures and the operating levy required per pupil in average daily membership. Thirty-six tests of the hypothesis concerning the relationship between the level of expectations for selected expenditures and the amount of funds allocated for these expenditures resulted in nine significant relationships (eight at .05 level and one at .01 level). District expenditures for insurance premiums accounted for five of the significant relationships: two concerning teacher health insurance and three concerning student accident insurance. The four remaining significant relationships were: (1) teachers' expectations for "budgeting money for keeping up with changes in the way subjects are taught" were negatively related to district expenditures for inservice programs; (2) the expectations of teachers and public officials concerning expenditures for health insurance for teachers were positively related to the amount spent for this insurance; (3) the expectations of citizens, teachers, and school board members for district expenditure for accident insurance for students were positively related to the amount spent for such insurance; and (4) expectations of citizens, school board members, and public officials concerning the extent to which school districts should charge for use of books and facilities were positively related to the amounts collected by the district for these purposes. In view of the relatively small number of significant relationships which were found, it was not possible to reject either of the two major null hypotheses investigated. Tests of the ancillary questions also failed to reveal any consistent significant relationships.

---

[1] John R. Thorson, "Expectations for the School Board Role as Related to Level of Local Financial Support and Allocation of Expenditures" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

[2] Frank B. Baker and Ronald Ragsdale, The Method of Reciprocal Averages for Scaling of Inventories and Questionnaires (Madison, Wisconsin: Laboratory for Experimental Design, The University of Wisconsin, November, 1964). (Mimeographed.)

Thorson concluded that the lack of consistent relationships between the major variables investigated suggested two possibilities: (1) there was a lack of perception by school board members of outside expectations for the school board role, or (2) many financial decisions were not within the control of the local school boards.

Expectations and Satisfactions of Effective and Ineffective School Board Members

Osterndorf[3] investigated the differences between effective and ineffective school board members with regard to the nature and consensus of their expectations for the public schools, expectations for the internal operating procedures of the school board, and satisfaction with the public schools of the district. Ancillary questions pertained to selected demographic variables and to personal and behavioral characteristics of effective and ineffective school board members.

---

[3] Alan D. Osterndorf, "Expectations and Satisfactions of Effective and Ineffective School Board Members" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

The 12 school districts that participated in the major research project formed the school district population for this study. Members of these school boards who were nominated as most effective or least effective by two or more of their peers on the individual boards provided the sample of 23 effective and 17 ineffective school board members. Data concerning the school board members' expectations for, and satisfaction with, the public schools were obtained by use of the personal interview instrument employed in the major research project. Items from the instrument which pertained to expectations for educational program, pupil personnel, staff personnel, educational finance, and the school plant; general expectations for the school; expectations for the internal operation of the school board; satisfaction with the schools of the district; and personal data concerning the respondents were utilized.

To test for possible differences between effective and ineffective school board members with respect to the nature and/or direction of their expectations and satisfactions, the method of reciprocal averages was utilized to quantify the basically qualitative data. Responses to interview items were weighted in terms of an underlying variable (traditional vs. modern) and scores indicating the expectations and satisfactions of a school board member were obtained. Consensus within a group of respondents was defined as the extent to which the members of the group tended to select a single response category of an item included in the interview schedule and was based on the construction of a confidence interval for a proportion.[4] The difference in the sum of the items for which each group of board members had consensus was tested for statistical significance. The effective school board members' expectations for the schools, and for each sub-grouping of these expectations, their expectations for the internal operation of the school board, and their satisfaction with the schools were compared with the expectations and satisfaction of ineffective school board members and of all members of the 12 school boards.

In general, Osterndorf concluded that the groups of effective and ineffective school board members revealed striking similarities with respect to their expectations for and satisfactions with the public schools. Statistically significant differences between the two groups were found for only two of 53 interview items. The responses to one of these items indicated that in formulating a school budget, effective school board members were concerned more with educational opportunities than they were with the extent of the tax burden, while ineffective board members considered educational opportunity and tax burden as equally important. Data for the other item indicated that effective school board members were more in favor of seeking increased federal aid for education than were ineffective board members. Effective school board members had significantly (at .01 level) more consensus in expectations for the school than did the ineffective board members. Significantly (at .05 level) more effective board members served as board presidents than did ineffective members. No significant differences were found between effective and ineffective board members with respect to such demographic variables as age, education, sex, religion, political preference, income, type of occupation, and number of children of school age. Members of the school boards perceived effective members to be highly task oriented while at the same time striving to see that members of the board worked together as harmoniously as possible. A school board member was perceived as being ineffective primarily because he was (1) new to the school board, (2) not interested in the functions and obligations of the school board, and (3) had what might be described as an "abrasive personality." The total body of data relating to consensus in expectations and satisfactions that Osterndorf examined led him to conclude that little dissension could be expected to exist between effective and ineffective school board members concerning what the school board should do to provide good educational opportunities for the school district and how the board should go about accomplishing its objectives.

---

[4] Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods, Revised Edition (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958), pp. 244-256.

Values, Belief Systems, and Satisfaction with the School Board Role

The relationships between the values and belief systems (open-closed mindedness) of school board members and the satisfaction which they derived from their school board role were investigated by Larson.[5] Relationships of values, belief systems, and satisfaction with the school board role to such personal variables of school board members as effectiveness in the school board role, tenure in office, age, education, and personal income also were examined.

The population of school board members in this study was composed of the 90 members of the 12 school boards governing the districts included in the major research project. Data pertaining to effectiveness and personal variables of school board members were obtained by use of the interview instrument employed in the major research project.

Separate instruments were employed to measure the values, belief systems, and satisfaction of the school board members. The

---

[5] Raymond O. Larson, "School Board Members' Values, Belief Systems, and Satisfaction With the School Board Role" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values[6] was employed to measure the relative prominence of six basic personality orientations: the theoretical, economic, esthetic, social, political, and religious. Open-closed mindedness (belief systems) was measured by administering the Haiman scale, a derivation of the California F scale of the Rokeach dogmatism scale with some additional items developed by Haiman.[7] School board members' satisfaction with their school board role was measured by a modified version of the satisfaction scale developed by Gross and his associates in their investigation of superintendent-school board relationships.[8] Of the 90 school board members included in the population, 79 returned instruments which provided data usable for this study. Correlation techniques and appropriate tests of significance were utilized to examine the major hypotheses and ancillary questions investigated.

No significant relationships were found between the values held by school board members and the satisfaction they derived from the school board role, nor was a significant relationship found between open-closed mindedness and satisfaction with this role. However, when the members of a school board were congruent in their belief systems (whether open or closed) they expressed significantly more satisfaction with the school board role than did the members of a school board whose members evidenced disagreement in belief. This relationship was significant at the .005 level of confidence. With respect to values of school board members and the degree to which they exhibited open or closed mindedness, it was found that theoretical and esthetic values correlated negatively with closed mindedness while economic and religious values correlated positively with closed mindedness. The four relationships were significant at or beyond the .01 level.

School board members who were satisfied with their role tended to rank highest in economic, theoretical, and religious values while board members dissatisfied with their role tended to rank highest in political, religious and economic values. Satisfied school board members tended to be more closed minded than did dissatisfied board members, and they were more likely to have children in the public schools. Satisfied board members were several years younger, less experienced as board members, not as well educated, and had less income than did their dissatisfied associates.

---

[6] Gordon W. Allport, Phillip E. Vernon, and Gardner Lindzey, The Study of Values (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), pp. 1-8.

[7] Franklyn S. Haiman, "A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Open-Closed Mindedness," Speech Monographs, 31:97-102 (June, 1964).

[8] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 358.

Effective school board members were inclined to give greater consideration to economic and political values, were more open minded, had more experience as board members, were better educated, and received substantially higher incomes than did ineffective school board members. The ineffective members gave greater consideration to economic and theoretical values. Both effective and ineffective board members were about equally satisfied with the school board role and about the same percentage in each category had children attending the public schools.

Other findings which Larson reported were: a significant relationship existed between the social values of school board members and their effectiveness, closed mindedness was significantly related (negatively) to level of income of school board members, effectiveness of school board members was significantly related (positively) to years of formal education, and no significant relationships were found between (1) closed mindedness and effectiveness in the school board role, (2) satisfaction with the school board role and effectiveness in the role, and (3) satisfaction with the school board role and the personal variables of age, years of formal education, tenure in office, and level of personal income.

Personal Characteristics and Board Member Reactions to Issues

Manz[9] investigated relationships of level of family income, length of tenure on the school board, and level of education of school board members to (1) their perceived intensity or concern to citizens and professional staff members of issues confronting the board and (2) their expressed satisfaction with the board's disposition of these issues. The perceived intensity of issues and the satisfaction of the school board members were examined with regard to issues concerning school plant, pupil personnel, staff personnel and educational finance, as well as for the combination of all issues with which the board dealt. In addition, the following relationships were investigated: (1) relationships between school board members' perceived intensity of issues to (a) size of the school district, (b) age of the school board members, (c) length of residence of school board members in the school district, and

---

[9] John H. Manz, "Personal Characteristics of School Board Members and Their Reactions to Issues Confronting the Board" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967).

(d) whether school board members had children enrolled in the local schools; and (2) relationships of school board members expressed satisfaction with the disposition of issues confronting the board to their (a) rated effectiveness by colleagues, (b) age, (c) length of residence, and (d) whether they had children enrolled in the local public schools.

The population of the study was composed of 88 of the 90 school board members in the 12 school districts included in the major research project. Data pertaining to the personal characteristics of the school board members were obtained from selected items of the School District Survey instrument which was employed in the major project. Data concerning board members' perceptions of intensity of issues and their satisfaction with the disposition of issues were obtained by use of the School Board Member Reactionnaire. The statistical procedures of one-way analysis of variance, the Scheffé post-hoc test, and Student's "t" test were used for analyzing the data.

With one exception, it was found that no relationship existed between length of membership on the school board and school board members' perceived intensity of issues confronting the board. A significant relationship at the .05 level was found to exist between length of membership and perceived intensity of issues relating to school plant. No significant relationships were found to exist between length of membership on the school board and satisfaction with the board's resolution of issues.

For purposes of examining the relationship between level of income of school board members and their perceptions of the intensity of the issues confronting the boards, school board members were classified into low, medium, and high income groups. Several significant relationships were found between level of income and perceived intensity of issues. School board members in the lowest income group perceived school plant issues as being of greater intensity than did members in the medium and highest income groups. The same finding prevailed with reference to perceived intensity of issues relating to pupil personnel, and to the totality of issues considered by the school boards. No significant relationships existed between level of family income and school board members' expressed satisfaction with the disposition of issues by the school boards.

Two of the five relationships investigated between level of education and school board members' perceived intensity of issues were found to be significant. There were significant relationships between the level of education of school board members and their perceived intensity of issues relating to school plant, and of all issues confronting the school boards. Again, no relationships were found to exist between level of education and school board members' expressed satisfaction with the resolution of issues.

Other findings of this study were: school board members whose annual family incomes were high tended to be regarded as effective by their fellow board members to a greater degree than school board members who had low family incomes, school board members in large districts tended to perceive issues which came before the board to be of less intensity or concern to citizens and professional staff members than did board members in small districts, school board members who had children in the public schools of the district tended to be less satisfied with actions taken by the board than were board members who did not have children in school, and there were no systematic relationships between the age of school board members and their perceptions of the intensity of issues confronting the boards.

Education Level, Family Income and Expectations of Citizens

The major purpose of a study by Carver[10] was to determine if citizens with various levels of education and of family income held different expectations for the role of the school board. Expectations for the role of the school board were assessed with respect to academic freedom for teachers and pupils (educational program), freedom for pupils in appearance and activities (pupil personnel), freedom for teachers in their private lives (staff personnel), and willingness to spend for education (expenditures for education). Each of the two major hypotheses was divided into four sub-hypotheses, one for each of the above aspects of education. Also, two ancillary questions were investigated: (1) relationships between education level and family income to citizens' attitude toward shared-time, tax-supported transportation for parochial-school pupils, and federal aid to education; and (2) relationships of expectations for the school board role held by citizens with various levels of education and of family income to self-role expectations of school board members.

Responses of 1794 citizens to 19 questions included in the interview instrument which was employed in the major research project provided the expectations and attitude data employed in this study. In addition, two personal background questions asked in the interviews provided data concerning the respondent's number of years of education completed and his total family income for the 1964 calendar year. The citizen respondents were classified according to five education levels and five family income levels. One-way analyses of variance were applied to the ten distributions of scores (five by education level and five by family income). F values significant at or beyond the .05 level were considered necessary to indicate significant relationships. In cases when, the F ratio was significant at or beyond this level, the Scheffe method of comparing means was employed.

---

[10] Fred D. Carver, "Relationships Between Education Level, Family Income, and Expectations of Citizens for the Role of the School Board" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

Differences in expectations held for the role of the school board among groups of citizens with various levels of education were found to be significant for each of the four aspects of education investigated, namely, academic freedom for teachers and pupils in the classroom, freedom of pupils from restriction of their appearance and activities, freedom for teachers in their private lives, and expenditures for education by the board of education. Generally, the lower the level of education of the citizens, the more conservative the expectations concerning these educational matters. Differences in expectations held for the role of the school board among the groups of citizens with various amounts of family income were also found to be significant for each of the four aspects of education investigated. Again, the lower the family income the more conservative were the expectations for academic freedom of teachers and pupils in classrooms, freedom of pupils from restriction of their appearance and activities, freedom of teachers in their private lives, and expenditures for education.

No significant differences were found between the various groups of citizens with different amounts of education, and of family income, with respect to shared-time for parochial-school pupils. The attitude of all groups of citizens toward shared-time was favorable. Significant differences in attitude of citizens toward tax-supported transportation for parochial-school pupils were found for groups of citizens with varying amounts of education. A similar relationship was found when the citizens were classified according to family income. In general, the fewer the number of years of education completed, and the lower the family income, the more favorable was the attitude of citizens toward tax-supported transportation for parochial school pupils.

Overall, the citizens expressed a favorable attitude toward federal aid for local schools. However, there were significant differences between the least-educated and most-educated groups and the poorest and the wealthiest groups with respect to this matter. The higher the education level on the one hand and family income on the other, the less favorable was the expressed attitude toward federal aid.

Carver also found, with respect to expectations for the role of the school board, that school board members were more like citizens who had 12 or more years of education, and family income of $10,000 or more, than they were like citizens with smaller amounts of education and family income. Also, school board members were more liberal in their expectations for academic freedom,

freedom for teachers in their private lives, and spending for the local schools than were citizens who had completed fewer than 12 years of education and whose annual family incomes were less than $10,000. Finally, the level of family income in relation to the median income of that particular community was found to be a more discriminating variable than the absolute level of family income when considered in relation to expectations for the role of the school board.

Political Party Identification and Expectations for Local Schools

A study designed to explore the relationships of political party identification of citizens, board members, public officials, and teachers in the 12 school districts included in the basic research project to the expectations of these groups for the public schools was conducted by Streich.[11] He also investigated (1) political party identification of the four reference groups and the evaluations which each made of the public schools and (2) the relationship of community of residence to the expectations of citizens who identified with the same political party.

Systems theory provided the basic theoretical setting for the study. Streich viewed both the political system and the local school system as sub-systems of the larger society. He considered that the vote and political party identification of the individual provided inputs for the political system and that the individual's expectations for financial support of the schools provided inputs for the local school system. These considerations led him to the assumption that there would be a relationship between the two types of inputs. The majority of Americans identify with either the Republican or Democratic party. Over a period of time, the two parties have differed rather consistently in their positions on political change, intervention in foreign affairs, and welfare issues. With respect to such issues the Republican party has assumed a more conservative attitude than has the Democratic party.

The four reference groups (citizens, school board members, public officials, and teachers) utilized in this study were the same as those utilized in the major research project. Twenty-five of the questions included in the interview schedule used in the major project, and which could be scaled on a conservative-liberal continuum, were selected for use in this study. Scores were obtained for the total of all questions and also for groups of questions related to controversial issues, increased social services, general financial support, educational innovations, and increased state aid and increased federal aid for the public schools. One-way analyses of variance were used to test the hypotheses. Significance of relationships were subsequently tested with the Scheffè post-hoc test of comparisons for means.

---

[11] William H. Streich, "Political Party Identification and Expectations for Local Schools" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

Strong relationships (.005 level) were found to exist between citizens' political party identification and their expectations for controversial issues, increased social services, financial support, increased state support, and increased federal aid. School board members' political affiliation was found not to be related to their expectations for the local public schools, except with respect to increased federal aid to the schools in which case the relationship was highly significant (.001 level). Board members identifying with the Republican party generally did not support increased federal aid. The findings with respect to the relationship of political party identification of public officials to their expectations paralleled rather closely the findings for the school board members. Political party identification was related to expectation for increased federal aid to the schools at the .01 level; however, the public officials differed from the school board members in that the political party identification of public officials also was strongly related to expectations for increased state support for the local schools. No significant relationships were found between teachers' political party identification and the kinds of expectations for the schools investigated in this study.

No statistically significant relationships were found between the evaluations that citizens, teachers, board members, and elected officials made of their schools and their political party identification. The tests which were made to determine if community of residence was significantly related to the expectations scores of citizens who identified with the same political party revealed highly significant relationships for Republicans and Independents, but not for Democrats.

Post-hoc tests of the significant F ratios indicated that Republicans were significantly more conservative than Democrats. Significant differences between Republicans and Democrats were found in the cases of five of the eight significant F ratios. In two of the eight cases Republicans were found to be significantly more conservative than Independents. The evaluations that citizens, teachers, board members, and public officials made of their public schools were not related to political party identification. Streich concluded that expectations of citizens, school board members, and public officials with respect to the question of increasing federal aid to local public schools are strongly related to the political party identifications of these reference groups. Republican citizens and board members were found to hold significantly more conservative expectations than did the Democratic citizens and board members, and Republican public officials were found to hold significantly more conservative expectations concerning increased federal aid than did either Independent or Democratic officials.

Expectations of Parochial- and Public-School Oriented Citizens

Meggers[12] investigated the nature of the expectations for the local board of education and for the local public schools held by parochial- and public-school oriented citizens. His purposes were: (1) to determine whether or not these two groups of citizens held significantly different expectations and satisfactions, (2) to discover whether there were differences in expectations and satisfaction between and among groups of citizens whose children were pre-school, in-school, or out-of-school, and (3) to investigate the relationship of religious affiliation of citizens to their attitudes toward the public schools.

Data obtained from the 1794 citizens included in the major research project were utilized for this study. The sample of citizens was placed into three major classifications: (1) those with no children, (2) those who were public-school oriented, and (3) those who were parochial-school oriented. Sub-groups were pre-established which included respondents whose children were pre-school, in-school, or out-of-school, and respondents who were affiliated with the Catholic, Lutheran, or other religions. Of the 1794 citizens, 294 reported that they had no children, 982 had children who attended only public schools, and 518 had one or more children who had attended parochial schools.

Data for this study were obtained from the responses to 20 of the questions included in the interview schedule utilized by the major research project. Twelve of the questions were classified as expectations questions and related to such topics as shared-time school programs; summer classes; discussions of religious beliefs, of evolution, and of sex in the classroom; and transportation of parochial pupils. Eight questions were classified as satisfaction questions and pertained to such topics as quality of the school program, of the teachers, the guidance program, pupil insurance program, school buildings, etc.

Interview responses were categorized as either definite (positive or negative) or indefinite. Indefinite responses were those when interviewees implied that they lacked information about a question by answering "no opinion" or "don't know." The indefinite responses were compared with the definite responses to discover whether certain groups of respondents had significantly less information about the schools than did other groups. The Chi-square statistical technique was used to determine significant differences between and among groups.

---

[12] John F. Meggers, "Expectations for the Role of the Board of Education Held by Parochial- and Public-School Oriented Parents" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

Significant differences (at or beyond the .05 level) were found between and among groups of respondents on various expectations questions. These differences related to shared-time programs, summer-school programs, teachers' salaries, and public transportation for parochial school pupils. Eighty-six percent of the parochial-school oriented respondents supported shared-time programs as compared to 73 percent of the public-school oriented respondents. Catholics were significantly more in favor of the shared-time programs than were Lutherans. There was a significant difference in the expectations of the public-school oriented respondents with children in school, or pre-school, as compared with those public-school oriented respondents whose children were out of school. A significantly larger percentage of respondents with pre-school children thought that teachers' salaries were too low than was true of respondents whose children were out of school. Citizens who were parochial-school oriented were significantly more in favor of providing transportation for both parochial school pupils and public school pupils than were the public-school oriented citizens. Parochial-school oriented Lutherans gave significantly greater support to transportation of parochial school pupils than did the public-school oriented Lutherans. Catholic respondents, in general, favored public transportation for parochial school pupils.

The data pertaining to the eight questions related to satisfaction with various aspects of the public schools revealed no significant differences between or among groups of respondents. In general, the responses indicated that most respondents were quite satisfied with the public schools.

A considerable number of significant differences between and among the various groups of citizens indicated that public-school oriented respondents with children in school were consistently more definite in their responses than were other groups of respondents. The responses of the group with children out-of-school, in comparison with other groups, indicated a significantly greater lack of information about the educational program, how well the board was informing citizens about the public schools, the quality of teachers, the guidance program, the school lunch program, and the effectiveness of reporting to parents about pupils' progress in school. Indefinite responses, which were interpreted as an indication of lack of information on the part of respondents, were found most often for questions relating to accident insurance for pupils, the level of expenditures for the public schools, and the level of teachers' salaries.

Meggers concluded that (1) respondents whose children were in school were more satisfied with the public school programs, and expected more educational opportunities, higher paid teachers, and better school facilities than did respondents whose children were out of school, (2) respondents with no children in school were not found to be anti-education, as is sometimes supposed, for their satisfactions were very similar to respondents with children in school, and (3) the implied lack of information about the public schools on the part of the various groups of respondents was so substantial as to have important implications for administrators and school board members with respect to the improvement of school-community relations.

Expectations and School District Innovativeness

Relationships of the degree of consensus of expectations for the school board role within and between groups of citizens, teachers, school board members, and public officials to the extent of innovativeness found in the 12 school districts included in the major research project were studied by LaPlant.[13] Three aspects of innovativeness were investigated: (1) degree or extent of innovativeness, (2) earliness of adoption of innovations, and (3) diffusion of innovations. Consensus of expectations for the role of the school board within the citizen group, the school board, the professional staff, and the public officials was considered, as was the consensus between the citizens and the professional staff, the citizens and the school board, the professional staff and the school board, and the public officials and the school board. The relationships of the extent of innovativeness to certain ancillary variables, such as size of school district, teacher-pupil ratio, current operating expenditures per pupil and tenure of the superintendent of schools also were studied.

In this study the school board was viewed as an interstitial body between the managerial and the community-system levels of the school organization, viewed as a social system. The samples of citizens and teachers, and the populations of school boards members and public officials were the same as those utilized in the basic research project. The data concerning the expectations for the school board role were those collected for the use of the major project. LaPlant prepared a list of 64 educational practices considered to be innovative. Data regarding the number of innovations adopted, the time of adoption, and the rate of spread within the district were collected by interviews which the investigator had with the district superintendent of schools and one other long-tenure administrator in each of the 12 districts.

---

[13] James C. LaPlant, "School District Innovativeness and Expectations for the School Board Role" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966).

Weights, based upon ratings of the educational innovations (practices), were used to give differentiated credit to the different innovations. Consensus indices developed for use in the major research project for each of the 12 districts were utilized. Analyses of variance were performed to test the differences of innovativeness in school districts of high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role. Relationships of the innovativeness measures relating to the school districts were investigated by using the product-moment correlation procedure.

Only two of the 22 operational hypotheses which were tested yielded F ratios which indicated significance at or beyond the .05 level. The relationship between the extent of innovativeness and consensus in expectations between citizens and teachers, and the relationship between earliness of adoption of innovations and consensus in the expectations between citizens and teachers, were found to be statistically significant.

Significant relationships were found to exist between innovative measures and certain ancillary data. The extent of innovativeness was positively related to the size of the school district, as measured by average daily pupil membership. The rate of diffusion of innovations within the districts after their adoption was related positively to the current operating expenditure per pupil in average daily membership and related negatively to teacher load as measured by the average daily pupil membership per teacher.

The extent of innovativeness exhibited by the districts and the earliness of the adoptions were significantly related to one another. However, the rate of diffusion of innovations within the districts once the innovations were adopted was not related to the other two aspects of innovativeness. Districts leading the way with early adoption of innovations may start out with pilot or experimental programs. This experimental approach could result in the number of innovations which were adopted at full potential to spread rather slowly. Other districts, not in the vanguard of innovators, might wait until the innovation has been proven by other districts and then proceed to adopt the innovative practice throughout the district in a short period of time. The findings of this study tend to indicate that once an innovation has been adopted, the rate of diffusion within a district may be speeded by spending more money per pupil and by reducing the work load per teacher.

LaPlant concluded that when the internal (teachers) and external (citizens) components of the school organization are in a high degree of agreement in their expectations for the school board role, the school district will be characterized as one which adopts more new educational practices at an earlier date than districts where this agreement does not exist.

Consensus in Expectations and Conflict Resolution

Sheehy[14] investigated the relationships of the degree of consensus in expectations for the school board role (1) within school boards, (2) between school boards and citizens, (3) between school boards and teachers, and (4) between school boards and public officials to role conflict resolution by school boards. As ancillary questions, relationships of school board size and school district size to conflict resolution and to perceived intensity of issues confronting the board were investigated.

The samples of 12 school districts, 1794 citizens, and 240 teachers, and the populations of 92 board members and 183 public officials were the same as those utilized in the major research project. Data concerning expectations for the school board role were obtained by interviewing members of the various reference groups as a part of the major project. Consensus was defined as the extent to which there existed "significant" agreement in the responses to interview questions. The procedure to test for such significant agreement was based upon the statistical inferences which can be made about a proportion. Data concerning role conflict resolution by the school boards were obtained from the Observers' Reports and the School Board Member Reactionnaires used at three consecutive meetings of each of the school boards. The variable of role conflict resolution was quantified by use of the formulae reported in Chapter II.

Relationships between the major variables, consensus in expectations for the school board role and role conflict resolution by the school boards, were tested by use of the Spearman rank order and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. Product-moment coefficients were used in place of rank order coefficients when there were more than four tied ranks.

Sixteen tests of the major hypotheses of the study were made and no one of them proved to be significant at the required (.05) level of confidence. Also, no significant relationships or differences resulted from the tests of the ancillary questions. The major conclusion reached, therefore, was that there were no relationships between consensus in expectations for the school board role and role conflict resolution by school boards. Also, there was no significant relationship between school district size, as measured by population, and conflict resolution by school boards nor between the number of people represented per school board member and the perceived intensity by school board members of the issues confronting the school boards.

---

[14] John M. Sheehy, "Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role and Conflict Resolution" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967).

Sheehy anticipated that consensus in expectations for the school board role would be significantly related to the operations of the school board but, in the light of his findings, concluded that apparently there were other factors which were more crucial. He conjectured that such factors might include the age and experience of board members, and the nature of the leadership provided for the board by the board chairman and/or the superintendent of schools.

Newspaper Reports of Conflict Regarding the Schools

A study of the relationships of the extent and the prominence of conflict between the community and the schools, as indicated in reports by local newspapers, to (1) consensus in expectations of citizens for the school board role and (2) the level of local financial support for the schools was conducted by Buchanan.[15] Also, attention was given to the following ancillary questions: "What is the nature of conflicts which are reported in the local newspapers?," "Do the editorials of the local newspapers tend to support or oppose official school board policies and actions?", and "Do local newspapers publish reports of conflict between the school board and the municipal government officials and, if so, what are the nature of the conflicts?"

Newspapers serving the communities in each of the 12 school districts included in the major research project were read by the investigator for the years 1960-1964 and the contents of the articles which indicated educational conflict were recorded and classified. The extent of conflict between the community and the schools was measured by the number of articles reporting conflict for each of the 12 districts. Prominence of conflict was measured by the location of the articles reporting conflict in the newspapers and the amount of space devoted to them. Criteria used to determine prominence included the page position of the article with page one given first rank and the local page, editorial, and other pages being given succeeding ranks; lead story or second story; top half of the page or bottom half of the page; and the number of columns covered by the story headline.

Data concerning consensus in expectations of citizens for the school board role were those obtained and utilized in the conduct of the major research project. Also, measures of level of local financial support for the public schools were those utilized in the major project, namely, total local mill rate for school purposes, mill rate for current operation, required levy rate for current operation, and local tax effort per pupil in average daily membership. The 12 school districts included in the study were rank ordered in terms of extent of conflict as reported in local newspapers, prominence of conflict as reported in local newspapers, consensus in expectations of citizens for the school board role, and in terms of each of the measures of local financial support for the schools. The school districts also were rank ordered in terms of the different classifications of conflict. Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were used to determine whether significant relationships existed between variables.

---

[15] Philip F. Buchanan, "Newspaper Reports of Conflict Involving the School and Community" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967).

No statistically significant relationships were found between the extent of conflict or the prominence of conflict, as reported in local newspapers, and consensus in expectations of citizens for the school board role or the level of local financial support for the public schools. Although the relationships were not statistically significant, the data did reveal two consistent relationships. One was a negative relationship between the degree of citizens' consensus in expectations for the school board role and the number of newspaper reports of conflict between community and schools. The other relationship, also negative, was between the level of local financial support for the public schools and the number of conflicts reported in the local newspapers. The higher the consensus of citizens' expectations and the higher the level of local financial support, the lower was the number of conflicts which were reported in the local newspapers. The researcher suggested that the small number of school districts included in the study may have contributed to the lack of statistically significant relationships among these variables.

Other findings of this study included the following: the newspapers included in the study tended to give a prominent place to reports of conflict concerning the schools, the editorial policies of the local newspapers tended to favor rather than oppose policies and actions of the school boards, a higher number of the reported conflicts related to the school plant than any other phase of school operation, and disagreements which were reported between school boards and municipal councils usually were about matters relating to the school plant or to the school budget.

Expectations of Community Influentials and Selected Community and Personal Variables

At the time of writing this chapter a study is being conducted by Habeck[16] to investigate the relationships of expectations for the school board role held by perceived community influentials to selected community variables and to selected personal variables of the influentials. Variables relating to the school districts include size as measured by number of pupils in average daily membership, wealth as measured by amount of equalized valuation per child in average daily membership, ratio of non-public school enrollments to total district enrollments, income levels as determined from census data for the largest municipality in each school district, and education level of the population as determined from census data for the largest municipality in each school district. Variables relating to the influentials include age, organizational memberships, length of residence in the school district, education level, and income level.

Community influentials included in this study were nominated by school board members, superintendents of schools, and public officials who were interviewed as a part of the procedure of the major research project. The 10 influentials who received the highest number of nominations in each of the 12 school communities constitute the sample of community influentials for this study. Each of these influentials will be sent a questionnaire which includes questions selected from the interview instrument employed in the major research project. The questions are grouped into four categories as follows: educational programs, staff salary and benefits, pupil services, and physical facilities. Community influentials included in the study who do not respond to the questionnaire will be contacted personally by the investigator in order to insure as nearly a 100 percent response from the influentials as possible. Data for the community variables will be obtained from the records of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction and from the United States Census reports. Data relating to the personal variables of the community influentials also will be collected by means of the questionnaire, or by personal interview. Analyses of variance procedures will be used to test the nature of the relationships between variables.

---

[16] Roy J. Habeck, "Expectations of Community Influentials for the Public Schools and Selected Community and Personal Variables" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, In Progress).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the paragraphs that follow, the hypotheses, the methodology, and the major findings of the research are summarized and the major conclusions are drawn which have implications for research or for practice.

Summary

The purpose of the present research was to investigate the nature of the role of the school board as an agency for resolving conflict between the school and the community. Based upon the theory of administration as a social process and the theoretical placement of the board of education as a conflict-resolving body in bargaining for resources for the school organization from the larger society, the following null hypotheses, derived from earlier empirical work, were subjected to test:

1. There is no difference in change in financial support in school systems of high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role.

2. There is no difference in change in budget allocations in school systems of high and low consensus in expectations for the school board role.

3. There is no difference in change in financial support in school systems of high and low resolution of school board role conflict.

4. There is no difference in change in budget allocations in school systems of high and low resolution of school board role conflict.

In addition to determining the relationships among the major variables of the study, relationships of certain of the major variables were assessed with regard to several ancillary factors, such as, type of school district, kind of reference group, type of questions asked, level of financial support, and nature of budget allocations.

Procedures

From the basic population of those 100 Wisconsin school districts providing instruction to at least 1,400 pupils in grades K-12, a sample of 12 school districts was drawn to provide a balanced distribution of districts, stratified according to the following: school district enrollment; ratio of pupil enrollment to equalized property valuation; ratio of non-public school enrollment to total district enrollment; fiscal dependence-independence; and degree of controversy in the school community.

The investigation was conducted over a three-year period in two phases. During the first phase of the study random samples of citizens and teachers in each school district, and all public officials and school board members in each district were interviewed to determine the expectations they held for the schools and the school board role. For all districts a total of 1,794 citizens, 240 teachers, 183 public officials, and 90 school board members were individually interviewed. Between- and within-group consensus indices were computed and tested for significance, through use of an analysis of variance design, with regard to the criteria for selection of districts and the nature of role segments sampled, both by type of question (functional area) and by individual question.

Also, during the first phase of the study, data regarding the following four measures of financial support were obtained: (1) total school tax rate; (2) school tax rate for current operation (based upon the actual equalized valuation of the district); (3) required levy rate for current operation (based upon the state guaranteed valuation of the district); and (4) the local tax effort per pupil (local tax levy divided by average daily membership). Likewise, data regarding the following budgetary allocation categories were obtained and standardized by expressing them as a ratio of expenditure per pupil in average daily membership: (1) salaries of professional staff; (2) salaries of clerical workers; (3) textbooks, library books, and periodicals; (4) instructional supplies; (5) total instructional cost; (6) salaries of custodians; (7) plant operation; (8) plant maintenance; (9) school lunch; (10) transportation; (11) capital outlay; and (12) debt service.

During the second phase of the study data were obtained regarding the resolution of role conflict by observing three consecutive meetings of each board during the budget adoption process. Nonparticipant observers obtained data for providing conflict resolution measures of board member participation, vote, and nature of board member behavior. Through the use of a reactionnaire distributed to each board member, conflict resolution measures also were obtained relative to perceived intensity of issues and to board member satisfaction with board actions taken.

To relate the data concerning consensus in role expectations and those concerning the resolution of conflict to the criterion measures of financial support and budget allocation, correlational and analysis of variance techniques were utilized.

Findings

The major findings of the study were as follows:

I. Regarding consensus in expectations for the school board role, it was found that:

A. Citizens in school districts having high and low ratios of non-public to total school enrollment had significantly less within-group consensus in expectations than did citizens in school districts having a medium ratio of non-public to total school enrollment (See pp. 46-48).

B. The degree of between-group consensus in expectations of public officials-school board members was significantly different in school districts having high, medium, or low extent of controversy in the school community (pp. 46-48).

C. Degree of within- and between-group consensus in expectations was not significantly related to school district size, wealth, or fiscal dependence-independence (pp. 46-48).

D. Degree of within- and between-group consensus in expectations was not significantly related to whether the questions were concerned with image of the board, educational program, pupil personnel, staff personnel, or current issues in education (pp. 48-50).

E. All of the 84 interview questions used to determine consensus in expectations contributed to one or more of the four within-group consensus measures, but seven of the questions did not contribute to one or more of the six between-group consensus measures (p. 51).

F. In only 33 instances out of 6,048 possibilities did two groups have within-group consensus, but hold opposing expectations (p. 53).

G. When expectations were analyzed by reference groups, citizens exhibited the greatest degree of within-group consensus in expectations, followed by teachers, public officials, and school board members, in that order (p. 54).

H. When expectations were analyzed by district, teachers exhibited the least degree of within-group variation in consensus indices, followed by citizens, school boards, and public officials, in that order (p. 54).

I. When expectations were analyzed by district, the between-group consensus in expectations of citizens-teachers was highest of the six between-group consensus indices, followed by citizens-public officials, teachers-public officials, teachers-school boards, citizens-school boards, and public officials-school boards, in that order. Thus, there was greater teachers-school boards consensus in expectations than citizens-school boards consensus (p. 54).

II. Regarding consensus in expectations for the school board role and financial support of the schools, it was found that:

A. Within- and/or between-group consensus in expectations was not significantly related to change in financial support; therefore, the first major null hypothesis of the study could not be rejected (pp. 67-69).

B. Within- and/or between-group consensus in expectations was, in certain instances, related to level of financial support. Specifically, it was found that:

1. Within-group consensus of citizens' expectations showed a statistically significant, positive relationship to three of the four financial support measures (FS 1, 2, 3) in each of the three successive years (pp. 55-63).

2. Between-group consensus in expectations of citizens-teachers showed a statistically significant, positive relationship to the required levy rate (FS 3) for current operation in each of the three successive years (pp. 55-63).

3. The relationship of within-group consensus of school boards' expectations to school tax rates, although not statistically significant, was consistently inverse (pp. 55-63).

4. When analyzed by high-low consensus districts, no statistically significant relationships were found between consensus in expectations and level of financial support. However, the relationship of within-group consensus of citizens' expectations to level of financial support consistently approached significance (pp. 63-67).

III. Regarding consensus in expectations for the school board role and budget allocations, it was found that:

A. Within- and/or between-group consensus in expectations was not significantly related to change in budget allocations; therefore, the second major null hypothesis of the study could not be rejected (pp. 80-83).

B. Within- and/or between-group consensus in expectations was, in certain instances, related to nature of budget allocations. Specifically, it was found that:

1. Within-group consensus of citizens' expectations showed a significant positive relationship to budget allocation for salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, and total instructional cost in each of the three successive years (pp. 70-77).

2. Within-group consensus of public officials' expectations showed a significant inverse relationship to budget allocation for plant operation in each of the three successive years (pp. 70-77).

3. School districts in which board members were high in within-group consensus in expectations tended to spend less per pupil for professional salaries and for total instructional cost than school districts in which board members were low in within-group consensus in expectations in each of the three successive years (pp. 70-77).

4. School districts in which board members were high in within-group consensus in expectations tended to spend more per pupil for operation of the school plant than school districts in which board members were low in within-group consensus in expectations in each of the three successive years (pp. 70-77).

5. Between-group consensus in expectations of citizens-teachers showed a statistically significant, positive relationship to budget allocations for salaries of professional staff, salaries of clerical workers, total instructional cost, and salaries of custodians, for each of the three successive years (pp. 70-77).

6. School districts in which there was a high consensus in expectations of teachers-school boards tended to spend less for professional salaries and for total instructional cost than school districts in which there was low consensus in expectations of teachers-school boards (pp. 70-77).

7. When analyzed by high-low consensus districts, no statistically significant relationships were found between consensus in expectations and budget allocation (pp. 77-80).

IV. Regarding conflict resolution by school boards, it was found that:

A. Degree of resolution of school board role conflict was not significantly related to change in financial support; therefore, the third major null hypothesis of the study could not be rejected (p. 88).

B. Degree of resolution of school board role conflict was not significantly related to change in budget allocations; therefore, the fourth major null hypothesis of the study could not be rejected (p. 91).

C. The types of issues resolved by boards of education, summarized from most frequent to least frequent, were as follows: school plant, staff personnel, finance, pupil personnel, unclassified, and instructional program (p. 87).

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of the major research project, as well as the findings of the related studies, several general conclusions may be drawn concerning the following topics: consensus in expectations for the school board role, the interstitial role of the school board, financial support and budget allocations, and the resolution of school board role conflict. Regarding each of these topics, implications for research and for practice will be noted, drawn largely from the experiences of the investigators in conducting the research.

Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role

The concept of consensus in expectations led to certain productive substantive conclusions, despite the fact that the measurement of consensus is fraught with several methodological limitations. Regarding consensus in expectations for the school board role, it may be conclusively stated that the groups interviewed did, indeed, differ in the extent to which they were in agreement about what the role of the school board either is or should be. Moreover, the extent of such consensus was shown to be meaningfully related to such variables as ratio of non-public to total school enrollment, extent of controversy in the school community, and type of reference group--whether citizens, teachers, public officials, or school boards. The conclusion that, of these four groups, the citizens exhibited the greatest degree of within-group consensus in expectations and the school board members the least degree of within-group consensus would seem to be worthy of further investigation, since one might presume that there would be greater agreement among school board members in expectations for their own role. Likewise, the conclusion that the teachers, across all districts, were more similar in consensus in expectations for the school board role than were the school boards seems worthy of note. It seems somewhat anomalous that school board members who are quite homogeneous with regard to such personal variables as level of schooling, level of income, and political party affiliation should exhibit a relative lack of consensus in expectations for the school board role. Whether such lack of consensus is a function of the mechanisms whereby individuals come to serve on school boards undoubtedly would be of research interest to political theorists; whether it is a function of differential motivations and values, likewise, would be of research interest to personality theorists. National, regional, and local associations of school boards might re-examine the extent to which their present publications, programs, clinics, conferences, and workshops fail to focus attention upon the primary components of the school board role.

With regard to the basic notion of consensus in expectations, the question can be raised of whether or not there may exist some "optimum" level of consensus. Conceivably, absolute unanimity in expectations either within or between groups could be equally as debilitating as absolute "dissensus" or lack of consensus in expectations. Thus, a postulated curvilinear relationship of consensus to appropriate criterion measures might be examined in fûture studies.

Concerning the conclusion that the concept of consensus in expectations possesses certain limitations, it is obvious that while degree of consensus is an important variable, the concept as defined in the present study begs the issue, "Consensus on what?" "On spending more for the schools?" "Or less?" Certain of the related studies cited in Chapter 4 utilized responses appropriately scaled along such underlying continua as "liberal-conservative" or "spend more-spend less." For the citizen respondents the nature of the expectations held was found to be meaningfully and systematically related to such variables as socio-economic level, political party identification, and religious orientation. But the multi-faceted objectives of the school as an institution and, hence, many of the expectations for the school board role, often defy reduction to such global scales. Moreover, there presently does not exist an appropriate taxonomy for meaningfully ordering the variables underlying such scales. At best, further research is needed, utilizing such combinations as economically liberal-socially conservative, etc., so that not only the consensus in expectations but also the nature of expectations might be assessed.

Another methodological limitation regarding the measurement of consensus in expectations should be noted. Perhaps the severest criticism of role studies conducted to date is that such studies have largely ignored the size of the respondent group in computing consensus; therefore, the larger the group the less likely it is that consensus will be attained. In attempting to cope with this criticism, the investigators in the present project utilized a stringent control for size of respondent group. Furthermore, the a priori reasoning that within-group consensus must exist as a condition for attaining between-group consensus tended to restrict the between-group consensus scores. Obviously, the operational definition of how much agreement is required before consensus may be said to exist may range, depending upon one's orientation, from a simple majority to a unanimous vote. In any event, the interpretations placed on such consensus indices, including the conclusions reported above, must be made in the light of the operational definitions of consensus which are utilized.

Finally, it should be noted that in the present investigation the "Don't Know" or "No Opinion" response was discarded in the computation of consensus. Fortunately, there were relatively few persons who answered "Don't Know" or "No Opinion." Respondents willingly (often emphatically) stated their expectations for the schools and the school board role. It was found, however, that citizens whose children had completed school, whose children attended non-public schools, or who had no children often were somewhat vague in their expectations regarding the educational program, the quality of teachers, the reporting of pupil progress, and how well the board was informing citizens about the public schools. Such findings clearly imply the need for more enlightening communication between the school and all of its sub-publics.

The Interstitial Role of the School Board

Several major findings lead to the conclusion that Parsons' placement of the school board as an interstitial agency in bargaining for resources from the larger society is a useful, but not sufficient, characterization of this role. These conclusions relate to the importance of the school board role; the nature of the expectations for the school board role held by citizens, public officials, teachers and board members; and the extent of between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role.

There was considerable evidence that the role of the school board member may not be globally subsumed within the "community-system" level. The school board role was singled out as one of relatively high esteem in comparison with that of city or village council member. Over two-thirds of the citizens, and over three-fourths of the teachers and the board members, rated the position of the school board member as equal to or greater in importance when compared with that of councilman. Even a majority of the sample of public officials, which was predominantly members of city or village councils, thought that the position of school board member was equal to or greater in importance than their own role as councilman.

Actual, rather than relative, importance of the school board role was assessed by giving respondents a list of decisions typically made in the schools and asking them who should take the most important part in making each decision. Here, it was found that school board members tended to attach less importance to the school board than did any of the other respondent groups, citizens at large, teachers, or public officials. In fact, it may be concluded that many board members engaged in role avoidance, delegating to the superintendent of schools most of the responsibilities assigned to the board by citizens, teachers, and officials. In view of this conclusion, the importance of the role of the superintendent of schools is underlined by the extent to which board members rely upon his professional expertise, judgment, and leadership. For practice, an implication may be drawn that there exists an increased need for public understanding of the role of the board of education vis a vis the superintendent of schools and how the school system does, indeed, "work."

Regarding the nature of the expectations for the school board role, it is concluded that the expectations of the board members, when compared with the other respondent groups, were more similar, in general, to the expectations held by the teachers than to those held by either the citizens or the public officials. Such was particularly the case with regard to value judgments with respect to the educational program, staff personnel, and pupil personnel. With respect to finance and business management, school plant, and current issues in education, however, board member expectations were sometimes more closely aligned with those of citizens at large and were occasionally aligned with those of public officials. Thus, it appears that the school board role defies generalized description and placement. It is largely "intra-organizational" in orientation to many role segments, but, as Parsons noted, somewhat "extra-organizational" with regard to the procurement-disposal function. If it is recognized that differential identification on the part of board members depends upon the nature of specific issues involved it might help to improve board-administrator working relationships.

A third conclusion regarding the interstitial nature of the school board role is that the board of education faces a unique dilemma in that the intra-organizational members (the teachers) are higher in agreement in expectations with extra-organizational members (the citizens) than is either group with the school board, itself. Of course, such citizens-teachers agreement could be due to a close working relationship of teachers and citizens or due to similarity of teachers and citizens on such background variables as income and political affiliation. In any event, it seems conceivable that citizens-teachers similarity in orientation might serve as a basis for organized efforts to shape the operational decisions of the board, for example, in a stressful collective bargaining situation. Clearly, the between-group consensus measures indicate that the simple linear model ranging from citizens' expectations, to board members' expectations, to teachers' expectations should be replaced with complex models of socio-like, multiple publics and sub-publics whose alignments and proximities may shift drastically by type of issue. Utilizing such models, researchers might also wish to examine such basic questions as the sources of difference in expectations and how such expectations may be changed or modified through time.

Financial Support and Budget Allocations

Two major conclusions reached with regard to financial support and budget allocations are (1) that change in these variables typically is not of sufficient magnitude over a three-year time span to permit the demonstration of meaningful relationships to other variables, and (2) that the level of financial support and the nature of budget allocations show certain meaningful, although not systematic, relationships to within- and between-group consensus in expectations for the school board role. Concerning change in financial support, it was found, by and large, that in most of the districts there were only limited incremental gains in both financial support and budget allocations, due to such factors as increased enrollments, district economic growth, lower pupil-teacher ratios, and the like. Moreover, the strong effect of the present Wisconsin program for the equalization of educational opportunity tended to reduce differences in the financial variables among the districts of this study. For the most part, it was the feeling of the investigators that the rank ordering of districts based upon such relatively miniscule changes as were found were of a spurious nature. Such was particularly the case with the budget allocation categories. For example, school districts that replaced several school buses might rank high in transportation costs, even over a three-year period, compared with other districts whose relative transportation costs taken over a longer time period might actually have been higher. In addition, state accounting codes notwithstanding, there generally is some lack of uniformity in invoice coding. For example, certain materials might be coded either as instructional supplies or as textbooks. With regard to these conclusions, it is suggested that in future studies which utilize change in financial variables, greater attention be given either to selecting districts on the basis of change or attention be given to the utilization of a longer time span for measuring change, since difficulty in finding and measuring change in the financial variables may have been the primary reason that the major null hypotheses of the study could not be rejected.

Several significant implications emerge from the conclusion that consensus in expectations was related to level of financial support. The within-group consensus in expectations for the school board role on the part of citizens, for example, showed a statistically significant, positive relationship to three measures of school tax rates in each of the three successive years. During the same time it surprisingly was found that the within-group consensus of school boards' expectations to the same measures of school tax rates, although not statistically significant, was consistently inverse. Evidently, within-group agreement on expectations does not represent a "generalized good" - at least as expressed in terms of taxes for the local schools. Further research might well be directed toward discovering the dynamics of the relationships of within-group consensus to school tax rates.

The finding that the between-group consensus in expectations of citizens-teachers showed a statistically significant, positive relationship to only one of the financial support variables, the required levy rate for current operation, raises questions regarding why this relationship held for only one of the tax support measures, and also why citizens-teachers (extraorganizational-intraorganizational) consensus was so related. For example, does this finding indicate that perhaps the board of education is somewhat isolated from its major reference groups? This and other questions should be examined to a further extent.

Concerning the relationship of the nature of budget allocations to consensus in expectations, the within-group consensus in expectations on the part of citizens again showed a significant, positive relationship to allocations for professional, clerical, and custodial salaries and for total instructional cost for each of the three successive years. Again, school districts having high within-board agreement tended to spend less for total instructional cost than districts in which board members were not in agreement in expectations. And again, the between-group consensus of citizens-teachers showed statistically significant, positive relationships to several budget allocation categories. By way of additional findings, it may come as no surprise to either school board members or superintendents that when public officials were in agreement there was a significant inverse relationship to budget allocation for school plant operation. Likewise, both teacher and school board organizations may wish to take note of the findings that when there was a high degree of consensus in expectations between teachers-school boards the districts tended to spend less for professional salaries and for total instructional cost. A need exists for additional studies of how expectations for a given role are shaped, how they may change through time, and whether or not causal or other underlying variables may be discovered.

Resolution of Conflict in the School Board Role

Regarding the resolution of conflict in the school board role it was concluded (1) that a useful distinction may be drawn between conflict and lack of consensus in role expectations and (2) that boards of education seldom resolve conflict in board meetings. Concerning the distinction between conflict in expectations and lack of consensus in expectations, it was found that in only 33 instances out of 6,048 possibilities did two groups have within-group consensus in expectations and, at the same time, hold opposing expectations that might be a basis for conflict. Although not specifically assessed in the present study, it may be hypothesized that even in those instances identified as having conflict potential, seldom were the disagreements actually perceived and understood. Only rarely did such potential conflicts relate to issues dealt with by the board. In addition, many such potential conflicts were between teachers-officials or other reference groups typically not involved in face-to-face interaction. Thus, it would appear that differences in expectations for the school board role are primarily incremental, rather than polar. The tendency of some investigators to characterize such incremental differences as "conflict" may tend to distort the picture of the actual role relationships within an organization.

Concerning the conclusion that school boards seldom resolve conflict in open board meetings, it was noted, among earlier stated conclusions, that boards exhibited a tendency to engage in role avoidance with respect to certain of the decision-making aspects of the school board role, delegating these responsibilities to the superintendent of schools. Despite the fact that the school boards were observed during three consecutive meetings devoted primarily to the budget adoption process, when presumably the major procurement-disposal functions of the board were operative, it was found that the boards tended to accept the budgetary recommendations of the subcommittees of the board or of the superintendent of schools. It is recognized, however, that frequently the process of budget adoption merely formalizes the fiscal components of earlier decisions. A substantial portion of any school budget is "fixed" in the sense that prior decisions commit the board to certain expenditures, e.g., principal and interest payments on school district bonds. Also, the process of collective bargaining with various employee organizations culminates in agreements concerning salaries and fringe benefits which must be reflected in the school district budget. In addition, the subtle pressures exerted to keep expenditures "in line" with those of similar districts may restrict the parameters within which school board members perceive that they are able to make decisions.

With respect to issues before the board, both budgetary and otherwise, it was observed that boards sometimes utilized inordinate amounts of time to reach unanimous agreement on matters which seemed from the viewpoint of the trained observers to be relatively trivial in nature. For example, school boards gave attention to more than three times as many issues dealing with the school plant than to those dealing with the educational program of the schools. In all school board actions, a press for unanimity was observed, since 89.3 percent of the issues resolved were by unanimous vote. Somewhat surprisingly, a post hoc comparison of board member satisfaction with regard to the manner in which issues had been resolved revealed that board members were sometimes highly dissatisfied with the action taken, even though they voted with a majority of the board. Thus, there is some evidence for concluding that board members exhibit differential tendencies to vote according to their convictions, and that many of them may ascribe inordinate emphasis to a "public show of unity."

It is admitted that non-participant observation as a technique for assessing the resolution of role conflict is not adequate. The presence of observers from the University, in itself, perhaps influenced the nature of the meetings. For example, in many of the districts the formal agenda for each of the three meetings observed grew progressively shorter and items at the last observed meetings were sometimes deferred. Moreover, no observations were made of meetings of the board committees, informal sessions of the board, or other board member contacts with relevant reference groups. In this regard, during board meetings seldom did board members mention having had contact with such constituent sub-publics; the legitimacy of reference group expectations or possible sanctions which might be invoked by such reference groups were never alluded to in open meetings of the board.

Finally, and to return to the basic theoretical framework upon which this study was based, there was considerable evidence to the effect that a focus on role expectations is, at best, only "half-powerful" in assessing the observed behavior of school boards. Idiosyncratic tendencies of board members to monopolize discussion or not to participate in discussion, to defer to others or to dominate others, to press a point of view or to yield to a majority or even a minority opinion, or to create tensions or to relieve tensions, all suggest that, in future research studies that deal with the resolution of conflict, equal attention be given to personal need-dispositions as to role expectations since both serve as determinants of behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

Allport, Gordon W., Vernon, Phillip E., and Gardner, Lindzey, The Study of Values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960, pp. 1-8.

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Benson, Charles S. The Economics of Public Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Benson, Charles S. (ed.) Perspectives on the Economics of Education: Readings in School Finance and Business Management. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Bloomberg, Warner Jr. and Sunshine, Morris. Suburban Power Structures and Public Education: A Study of Values, Influence, and Tax Effort. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Charters, W. W. Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Gage, N. L. The American Educational Research Association, Chicago: Rand-McNally Company, 1963, pp. 718-813.

Epstein, Leon D. Votes and Taxes. Madison: Institute of Government Affairs, University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1964.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education. ed. Halpin, Andrew W. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958, pp. 150-165.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Guba, Egon G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review 55, (Winter, 1957), 423-44.

Getzels, Jacob W., Lipham, James M., and Campbell, Roald F. Educational Administration As A Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Thelen, Herbert A. "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System," Dynamics of Instructional Groups, N.S.S.E. Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: The Society, 1960, pp. 53-82.

Goldhammer, Keith. "The School Board and Administration in the American Perspective of Government," American School Board Journal, 129, (November, 1954), pp. 29-31 and (December, 1954), pp. 29-30.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Analysis," Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects. eds. Merton, Robert K., Broom, Leonard, and Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr. New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 400-28.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Haiman, Franklyn S. "A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Open-Closed Mindedness," Speech Monographs, 31 (June, 1964), 97-102.

Hirsch, Werner Z. "Determinants of Public Education Expenditures," National Tax Journal, 13 (March, 1960), pp. 29-40.

Hoyt, Cyrill. "Test Reliability Obtained by Analysis of Variance," Psychometrika, 6 (June, 1941), pp. 153-60.

James, H. Thomas. School Revenue Systems in Five States. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 803. Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, 1961.

James, H. Thomas, Thomas, J. Alan, and Dyck, Harold J. Wealth, Expenditures, and Decision-Making for Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1241. Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1963.

Johnson, D. Gale. "Economics and the Educational System," Perspectives on the Economics of Education: Readings in School Finance and Business Management. ed. Benson, Charles S. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1963, pp. 367-77.

Jonassen, Christen T. and Peres, Sherwood H. Interrelationships of Dimensions of Community Systems. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1960.

Linton, Ralph. *The Study of Man*. New York: D. Appleton Century Co., 1936.

Mayo, Alton. *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1945.

Merton, Robert. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Miner, Jerry. *Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Newcomb, Theodore M. "Role Behavior in the Study of Individual Personality and of Groups," *Journal of Personality*,18 (January, 1950).

Newcomb, Theodore M. *Social Psychology*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott. "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Organization," *Administrative Theory in Education.* ed. Halpin, Andrew W. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958, pp. 40-72.

Parsons, Talcott. *The Social System*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

Parsons, Talcott and Shils, E. A. *Toward A General Theory of Action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Peterson, LeRoy J., *et al*. *Economic Impact of State Support Models of Educational Finance*. Cooperative Research Project No. 1495. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. and Dickson, William J. *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration*. Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1947.

Siegel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Stapley, Maurice. *School Board Studies*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

State Department of Public Instruction. Official School Directory, 1964-1965. Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1964.

Thomas, J. Alan. "Efficiency in Education: An Empirical Study," Administrator's Notebook, XI (October, 1962), pp. 1-4.

Walker, Helen M. and Lev, Joseph. Elementary Statistical Methods (Revised Edition). New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Trans. by Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press and Falcon's Wing Press, 1947.

Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. Manual for Interviewers. Madison: University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Unpublished Material

Baker, Frank B. and Ragsdale, Ronald. The Method of Reciprocal Averages for Scaling of Inventories and Questionnaires. (Madison, Wisconsin: Laboratory for Experimental Design, The University of Wisconsin, November, 1964). (Mimeographed.)

Buchanan, Philip F. "Newspaper Reports of Conflict Involving the School and Community." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Carver, Fred D. "Relationships Between Education Level, Family Income, and Expectations of Citizens for the Role of the School Board." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "A Community Develops Educational Policy: A Case Study." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1958.

Habeck, Roy J. "Expectations of Community Influentials for the Public Schools and Selected Community and Personal Variables." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, in progress.

LaPlant, James C. "School District Innovativeness and Expectations for the School Board Role." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Larson, Raymond O. "School Board Members' Values, Belief Systems, and Satisfaction With the School Board Role." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

McCarty, Donald J. "Motives for Seeking School Board Membership." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959.

Manz, John H. "Personal Characteristics of School Board Members and Their Reactions to Issues Confronting the Board." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Meggers, John F. "Expectations for the Role of the Board of Education Held by Parochial- and Public-School Oriented Parents." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Osterndorf, Alan D. "Expectations and Satisfactions of Effective and Ineffective School Board Members." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Shaw, John S. "A Study of the Changes in Opinions of School Board Members in Oklahoma on Selected Principles of Education." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964.

Sheehy, John M. "Consensus in Expectations for the School Board Role and Conflict Resolution." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Streich, William H. "Political Party Identification and Expectations for Local Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Thorson, John R. "Expectations for the School Board Role as Related to Level of Local Financial Support and Allocation of Expenditures." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Williamson, Frank E. "A Study of the Causes of Discordant School Boards." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1961.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

______ Office Number
Project 187
March-April, 1965

The University of Wisconsin
Extension Division
Survey Research Laboratory

SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

1. We are interested in how you feel about several aspects of the public schools in your community. In general, would you say that the educational program--the things that are taught--of your public schools here is excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 3)

2. Why do you feel this way about the educational program here? (BE SPECIFIC)

______

______

______

______

3. In your opinion, should your local schools emphasize vocational subjects most, or should college preparation courses have the most emphasis?

/Vocational/ /Both same/ /College prep./ /Depends/ / D K / (TO Q5)

4. And, why do you think this would be best? (On what does it depend?)

______

______

______

5. Considering the local school board for a moment...what--if anything--has your school board done which you think was exceptionally good?

______

______

______

6. And what--if anything--has the school board done which you think was exceptionally bad? ______

______

Interviewer's Name: ______ Int. No.: ______

Date: ______ Time Started: ______

7. Which position do you think is more important: being a member of the school board, or being a member of the city (village) council?

/School board/ /Both same/ /Council/ /Don't know/

8. What educational qualifications do you think school board members should have? ______________________________

____

____

____

9. As you see it, what reasons should a person have for wanting to serve on a school board? /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 11) ______________________________

____

____

____

10. In your opinion, did any of the present members of your school board have other reasons for serving on the school board?

/Yes/ (GO TO Q 11) /No/ ↓ /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 11)

10a. What were these other reasons? ______________________________

____

____

____

11. How many members does your school board have? ______(#) /Don't know/

12. Do you know personally, or know of, any of the members of your local school board?

/Yes: know personally/ ↓ /Yes: know of/ ↓ /No/ (TO Q 13, BELOW)

12a. In your opinion, are the school board members you know (of) "good" members, or not so good? /Good members/ /Not so good/ / D K /

13. Have you yourself ever been a school board member? /Yes/ /No/

14. Would you, yourself, consider running for membership on the local school board (again)?

/Yes/ /No/ /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 16)

15. Why do you feel this way about running for the school board?

16. Do you know of any practice used in this school district to encourage certain persons to run for the school board?

/Yes/ /No/ (TO Q 17)

16a. What is this practice?

17. In your opinion, should a member of the school board be elected at large where all the people in the district vote on every candidate, or should each candidate run from a certain section of the district and be voted on only by the people who live in that section?

/At large/ /Certain section/ /Don't know/ (TO Q 19)

18. Why do you think this would be best?

19. Should members of your school board be paid a salary, or not?

/Yes: should/ /No: should not/ /Don't know/ (TO Q 21)

20. Why do you feel this way?

21. Do you think it's a good idea, or not, for a member of the school board to serve as a spokesman for a particular group of persons, such as an occupation, business, or religious group?

/Good/ /Both good and bad/ /Not good/ /Don't know/

22. In your opinion, is it all right for the school board to decide an issue in a certain way because of pressures from a group of citizens who have a special interest in a problem, or should the board never do this?

/All right/ /Depends/ /Never do this/ /No opinion/

23. To your knowledge, how frequently has your school board made decisions in a certain way because of pressures brought to bear by special interest groups...would this be often, sometimes, or never?

/Often/ ↓ /Sometimes/ ↓ /Never/ (GO TO Q 24) /Don't know/

23a. What types of special interest groups have done this?

____

____

____

____

24. In regard to informing citizens about public schools, do you feel that your school board is doing an excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor job?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ / D K /

25. In comparison with the information you have about the operations of other local government agencies--such as the village board or city council--is the information you have about the school board greater, about the same, or less?

/Greater/ ↓ /Same/ (TO Q 26) /Less/ ↓ /Don't know/ (TO Q 26)

25a. Why is this the case? ______________________________

____

____

____

____

____

____

26. How do you find out about the decisions the school board makes at its meetings?

27. In your opinion, is it a good idea--or not really necessary--for the school board to let people know before-hand the items which will be covered at the next board meeting?

/Good idea/ /Not necessary/ /Don't know/

28. Does your local school board do this? /Yes/ /No/ /Don't know/

29. Do you think the decisions made at school board meetings usually are "cut and dried" -- actually made before the meeting -- does this sometimes happen, or is this almost never the case?

/Usually/ /Sometimes/ /Almost never/ / D K /

30. In your opinion, does the school board usually act as a "rubber stamp" for the superintendent of schools -- just approving the things he wants -- does this sometimes happen, or is this almost never the case?

/Usually/ /Sometimes/ /Almost never/ / D K /

31. As you see it, should the school board be organized into sub-committees with different special concerns--such as courses of study, building maintenance, and finance--or should the board as a whole handle this without sub-committees?

/Sub-committees/ /Board as a whole/ /Don't know/

32. Do you think it is a good idea, or not, for the school board to have Citizen's Committees to advise the board on ways to solve problems facing the schools?

/Yes/ ↓ /No/ ↓ /No opinion/ (GO TO Q 33)

32a. What are some problems where you think a Citizen's Committee would be a good idea?

32b. Why do you feel these Citizen's Committees are are not a good idea?

33. What kinds of problems, if any, should a citizen take directly to the school board rather than to the school principal or superintendent of schools? ______________________________

34. What kinds of problems are there, if any, where the school board should deal directly with school employees--teachers, custodians, and so forth--rather than through the superintendent of schools?

35. This card lists several things that must be done in any school system. (SHOW CARD 1) For each one, please tell me whether you think the school board, or the school superintendent, or the teachers should take the most important part in deciding how it should be done. (CHECK EACH ITEM ON CARD 1)

	MOST IMPORTANT					
CARD 1	School Board	Super-intend.	Teachers	ALL	D K	
A. Selection of new teachers.						A.
B. Making rules for pupil discipline.						B.
C. Selection of sites for new schools.						C.
D. Choosing textbooks.						D.
E. Planning a course of study.						E.
F. Selection of instructional equipment.						F.
G. Planning a new school.						G.
H. Purchasing school supplies.						H.
I. Setting-up routes for school buses.						I.
J. Inspecting school buildings for needed maintenance.						J.
K. Preparing the school budget.						K.

36. Switching to another aspect of your schools...generally speaking, do you think it's a good idea, or not, to allow parochial school pupils to take classes such as industrial arts or home economics in the public schools?

/Good idea/ /Depends/ /Not good/ /No opinion/

37. Should extra-curricular activities in the public schools--such as athletics--be a regular part of the tax-supported school budget, or should these things be self-supported without tax money even if it means that some of them would be discontinued?

/Tax-supported/ /Depends/ /Self-supported/ /Don't know/

38. Do you think a summer school should be provided for children in this district, or is this not necessary?

/Should be/ → 38a. What do you think should be covered in a summer school program?

/Depends/ → /Not necessary/ → 38b. Why is a summer school program not necessary? (On what does it depend?)

/Don't know/ (GO TO Q 39)

____

____

____

____

I'm going to read some statements you sometimes hear people make about how they think schools should be operated. For each one, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree with it, you agree, you both agree and disagree, you disagree, or you strongly disagree with it. (SHOW CARD 2)

39. The first statement is: "The school board should spend more money to keep up with changes in the way subjects are taught." _____(#)

CARD 2

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Agree-Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. No opinion

40. "The school board should provide funds to keep the average number of pupils per class about the same as in other communities similar in size to this one." _____(#)

41. "The school board should allow teachers and pupils in high school to discuss the pros and cons of communism." _____(#)

42. "The school board should allow teachers and pupils in high school to discuss the beliefs of various religious groups." _____(#)

43. "The school board should allow teachers and pupils in high school to discuss theories of evolution." _____(#)

44. "The school board should budget money for experiments with new teaching methods and materials." _____(#)

45. "Exceptionally bright children should be permitted to start kindergarten even though they are younger than the usual starting age." _____(#)

46. "Exceptionally bright pupils should be allowed to skip grades."_____(#)

47. "Pupils who have failed a grade or
class should be required to repeat it."_____(#)

48. "Pupils should be permitted to be
absent from school for family vacations."_____(#)

49. "Pregnant girls who are married
should be permitted to attend high school."_____(#)

50. "When they believe it's necessary, principals and teachers should
be allowed to use reasonable physical force in disciplining pupils."_____(#)

51. "The schools should be allowed to decide
the proper dress and grooming of pupils."_____(#)

52. "Pupils should be permitted to give gifts
to teachers that cost more than one dollar."_____(#)

53. That's all for this series of agree-disagree questions. Now I'd like to ask if you feel it's a good idea, or not, to include courses in public high school which deal with sex education?

/Good/ /Depends/ /Not good/ /No opinion/
(GO TO Q 55)

54. Why do you feel this way? (On what does it depend?)

55. In general, would you say the teachers here in your school district are excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ /Don't know/
(GO TO Q 57)

56. What are your reasons for feeling this way about the teachers in this district? (BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE)

57. Do you feel the pay scale for public school teachers in this district is too low, about right, or too high?

/Too low/ /About right/ /Too high/ /No opinion/
(GO TO Q 59)

58. Why do you believe this is so?____________________________________

____

____

____

____

59. Do you think that the amount of college training a good teacher has had, or the number of years a good teacher has been teaching, should be most important in determining the salary a teacher should be paid?

/College/ /Years teaching/ /Don't know/

Other:____

60. In general, should a male teacher with children receive a higher salary than an unmarried teacher?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

61. Should teachers who plan and supervise student activities outside of school time receive a higher salary than teachers who do not do this?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

62. And, should teachers who take an active part in the life of your community receive a higher salary than teachers who do not do this?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

63. If they want to, do you feel it should be permissible for teachers in your district to drink alcoholic beverages in public places?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

64. Should it be permissible for teachers in your district to smoke in the presence of pupils when neither the teachers nor the pupils are involved in school activities?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

65. Should the school board require that all of the teachers in your district live inside the district?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

66. Should your teachers be required to get the permission of the school board before they accept outside employment during the school year?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

67. Should teachers in your district be expected to participate in various community activities?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

68. And, should the activities of your district's teachers in political organizations be discouraged?

/Yes/ /Depends/ /No/ /Don't know/

This next series of statements refers to other things the school board might do in hiring and supervising teachers in your district. For each statement, please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree that the school board should do it. (SHOW CARD 2)

69. First: "It should give preference to local residents when hiring teachers." _____(#)

CARD 2

---

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Agree-Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. No opinion

70. "It should try to hire teachers so that a variety of political, economic, and religious beliefs are represented on the faculty." _____(#)

71. "Members of the school board should feel free to do what they can to help people they know get jobs as school cooks, janitors, or bus drivers." _____(#)

72. "It should require teachers to continue taking additional college work every so often." _____(#)

73. "The school board should give leaves of absence with partial pay to allow teachers to take additional college work if the teachers agree to return to the local school district." _____(#)

74. "It should hold a hearing when a teacher who has been dismissed asks for it." _____(#)

75. "It should contribute to health insurance for teachers." _____(#)

76. "It should try to pay higher teacher salaries here than are paid in school districts of similar size." _____(#)

77. "It should employ teachers during the summer to revise courses and develop new courses." _____(#)

78. In general, would you rate the counseling and guidance the public schools here now provide for pupils as excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ /Don't know/

79. Do you think it would be a good idea, or not, for your school district to provide transportation to and from schools for parochial school pupils as well as public school pupils?

/Good idea/ /Depends/ /Not good/ /Don't know/

80. How do you feel about the idea that transportation to and from schools should be provided for those public school pupils who live within two miles of the school?

/Good idea/ /Depends/ /Not good/ /Don't know/

81. The school board also has to consider possible programs of accident insurance on pupils. How would you rate the program your public schools now have for providing accident insurance on pupils?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Don't know/

82. In your opinion, should accident insurance be provided for all public school pupils at the expense of the school district, or not?

/Should/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

83. Do you think the schools should charge rental fees for items such as textbooks, workbooks, and lockers, or should these be provided without charge by the school district?

/Should charge/ /Depends/ /Be provided/ /Don't know/

84. People have different ideas about the kind of program the public schools should follow with respect to serving lunches to pupils. Would you rate the present school lunch program of the public schools in your district as excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ /Don't know/

85. Do you believe that the public schools should serve a hot lunch even though this costs the district some money; or, should a hot lunch be served and the pupils charged enough so that there is no cost to the district; or, should the schools not serve a hot lunch at all?

/Costs money/ /Charged enough/ /No lunch/ /Don't know/

86. Turning to extra-curricular activities...in your opinion, should a pupil who breaks school rules and regulations be allowed to engage in extra-curricular activities--such as sports and school clubs--or not?

/Should be/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

87. Should a pupil who gets married be allowed to participate in extra-curricular activities, or not?

/Should be/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

88. How about pupils who are failing in a subject...should they be allowed to participate in extra-curricular activities, or not?

/Should be/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

89. How would you rate the way the public schools here inform parents about how well their children are doing in school?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ / D K /

90. In addition to the usual report card, do you think that teachers should have personal conferences with the parents of pupils in their classes, or isn't this necessary?

/Should/ /Depends/ /Not necessary/ /Don't know/

91. Would you be in favor of, or opposed to, the rule that each pupil's I.Q. -- intelligence quotient -- be reported to the pupil's parents?

/Favor/ /Depends/ /Opposed/ /Don't know/

92. The solicitation of funds by pupils both in and out of school is of concern in many communities. How do you feel about pupils in your district soliciting money from the public and businessmen for such activities as the school yearbook, the school paper, and so forth...should this be permitted, or not?

/Permitted/ /Depends/ /Not permitted/ /Don't know/

93. Should fund drives within the schools be permitted, or not?

/Permitted/ /Depends/ [✓ /Not permitted/] /Don't know/

94. One of the biggest jobs facing the school board is the preparation of a school budget. Overall, would you say that the amount of money your school board is spending on the public schools here is not enough, about right, or too much?

/Not enough/ /About right/ /Too much/ /Don't know/

95. In preparing a school budget, do you think it's better to have the school superintendent work-out a proposed budget first, or should the school board develop its own proposed budget?

/Super. work-out/ /Depends/ /Board develop own/ /Don't know/

96. In preparing a budget, is it a good idea, or not, to ask teachers to recommend items which they think should be included?

/Good/ /Depends/ /Not good/ /Don't know/

97. Do you think taxpayers--parents and others--should, or should not, be asked to make recommendations about items they think should be included in the school budget?

/Should/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

98. In considering the school budget, should the school board's primary attention be to the tax burden, or to the educational opportunities they would like to provide?

/Tax burden/ /Both same/ /Educational opport./ /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 100)

99. Why do you feel this way? ______________________________

____

____

____

100. Many school boards experience difficulties in explaining a proposed school budget to the public. What are your ideas as to the best way this can be done?

A very important job of the school board is planning for the future educational needs of the district. The next series of statements will tell us how you feel about this topic. Again, for each statement, tell me how strongly you agree or disagree that this is what should be done in your district. (SHOW CARD 2)

101. The first statement is: "To meet long-range building needs, the school board should spend district money to publicize the need for new school buildings." _____(#)

CARD 2

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Agree-Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. No opinion

102. "The school board should buy school sites well ahead of the time when schools will be built on them." _____(#)

103. "Representatives of the general public should be involved in the planning of new school buildings." _____(#)

104. "The school board should see to it that school facilities are provided which can be used by adult groups in the community." _____(#)

105. "New school buildings should include facilities for the latest educational practices such as team teaching and language laboratories." _____(#)

106. "New school buildings should include a swimming pool." _____(#)

107. "Even if the cost is somewhat higher, the school board should patronize local businesses when buying school supplies, equipment, and insurance." _____(#)

108. "All school supplies and equipment should be purchased by asking suppliers to submit bids on what is needed and then buying from the lowest responsible bidder." _____(#)

109. In general, would you rate the school buildings in your district as excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

/Excellent/ /Very good/ /Good/ /Fair/ /Poor/ /Very poor/ /Don't know/ (GO TO Q 111)

110. Why do you feel this way about the school buildings here?

111. The role of state and federal government aid to local schools is still a topic of much discussion. In your opinion, should the school board in this district work for greater financial aid to its schools from the Wisconsin state government, or not?

/Should/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

112. Should your school board work for greater financial aid to its schools from the federal government, or not?

/Should/ /Depends/ /Should not/ /Don't know/

This next card lists various things a citizen can do in connection with the public schools. For each one, please tell me if you've done it and--if you have--whether or not this was during the last three years. (SHOW CARD 3)

	113. Have you done it?		113a. (IF YES) During the last 3 years?	
CARD 3	YES	NO	YES	NO
A. Have you attended any school function such as an athletic event, an open-house, or so forth?				
B. Attended an annual meeting of the school district?				
C. Attended a school budget hearing?				
D. Voted in a school board election?				
E. Voted in a school bond referendum?				
F. Served on a citizen's committee to advise the school board?				

114. We want to make sure that we give everyone who wants to a chance to be heard in this research...in most communities there are certain people who exert considerable influence on community decisions. What are the names of some residents in this community whom you consider influential?

________________, ________________, ________________, ________________

115. Can you give us the names of persons who live around here and are particularly concerned with and exert an influence on education in this community? (MAY OR MAY NOT INCLUDE PERSONS NAMED ABOVE)

________________, ________________, ________________, ________________

116. We are also interested in the kinds of clubs and organizations people in your community belong to. Which of the types of groups shown on this next card are you a member of? (SHOW CARD 4)

✓ CARD 4

___ LABOR UNIONS.

___ CHURCH-CONNECTED GROUPS: Like a men's club, Holy Name Society, or a missionary society.

___ FRATERNAL ORGANIZATION OR LODGE: Like Masons, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Eastern Star.

___ VETERANS ORGANIZATION: Like American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

___ CIVIC GROUPS: Like Rotary or Lions Club.

✓ CARD 4 (Continued)

___ PROFESSIONAL GROUPS: Like the American Medical Association.

___ PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATIONS.

___ BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS: Like the National Association of Manufacturers.

___ OTHER CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS: (Please specify)

____

____

___ No Memberships.

117. Now, I have some background questions, the answers to which will help us in interpreting the results of this survey. First, are you employed now, looking for work, retired, or what?

/Employed/ /Looking/ /Retired/ /Housewife/ (TO Q 118) OTHER: ____________

117a. What job are you now working at? (BE SPECIFIC)

117b. What kind of job did you have on the last regular job you had?

____

117c. Do (Did) you work for yourself (then), or not?

/Work for self/ /Not work for self/ /Both/

118. What is your age? ________

119. Were you born and raised right here in this community?

/Yes/ (GO TO Q 120) /No/

119a. In what year did you move to this community? ________ (YEAR)

119b. Where did you live just before you moved to this community?

________________(TOWN OR CITY), ________________(STATE)

120. IS R NOW LIVING ON A FARM? /Yes/ (GO TO Q 121) /No/

120a. Have you ever lived on a farm for at least a year? /Yes/ /No/

121. What is the highest grade of school or year of college that you finished?

________(GRADE OF SCHOOL), (GO TO Q 122) or ________(YEAR OF COLLEGE)

121a. What college did you attend? ________________

121b. Have you ever been a public school teacher? /Yes/ /No/

122. Did you get any of your grade or high school education in a school that belonged to a church or religious group?

/Yes/ /No/ (GO TO Q 123)

122a. What grades did you attend at this school? ________________

122b. What religious group ran this school? ________________

123. What is your religious preference now, if any?

/Protestant/ /Roman Catholic/ /Jewish/ (GO TO Q 124) OTHER: ________________ (GO TO Q 124) /None/ (TO Q 12

123a. What denomination is that? ________________

124. About how often do you usually attend religious services?

/At least once/week/ /Few times a month/ /Once a month/ /Few times a year/ /Once a year/ /Less often/ /Never/

125. Generally speaking, in politics do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

/Republican/ /Democrat/ /Independent/ /Other/ /No Pref./

125a. Would you say that you are a strong or not so strong (Republican; Democrat)?

/Strong/ /Not so strong/

125b. In general, do you consider yourself closer to the Republican or to the Democratic party?

/Rep./ /Dem./ /Neither/ /No pref./

126. During the last ten years, would you describe yourself as a regular voter, or not? /Regular/ /More or less/ /Not/

127. Have you ever done any campaign work during school board elections?

/Yes/ /No/

128. Have you ever done any campaign work during local elections for offices other than the school board?

/Yes/ /No/

129. Have you ever done any campaign work during state or national elections?

/Yes/ /No/

130. Have you ever been a candidate for an elective office (other than for the school board)?

/Yes/ /No/

131. A few final questions...do you pay real estate taxes in this school district?

/Yes/ /No/ /Don't know/

132. What was your approximate total family income in 1964 considering all sources such as rents, profits, wages, interest, and so on? (SHOW CARD 5)

CARD 5

/A. Under $1,000/ /E. $4,000 - $4,999/ /I. $8,000 - $8,999/

/B. $1,000 - $1,999/ /F. $5,000 - $5,999/ /J. $9,000 - $9,999/

/C. $2,000 - $2,999/ /G. $6,000 - $6,999/ /K. $10,000 - $14,999/

/D. $3,000 - $3,999/ /H. $7,000 - $7,999/ /L. $15-19,000/ /M. $20,000+/

133. Are you married, widowed, separated, divorced, or never married?

/Married/ /Widowed/ /Separated/ /Divorced/ /Never married/
(TERMINATE INTERVIEW)

134. How many children do you have?

/None/, or (GO TO NEXT PG) ____ (# CHILDREN)

134a. How many children, if any, do you have who are of pre-first grade age?

/None/, or (GO TO Q 134c) ____ (#)

134b. Do you plan on sending this child (any of these children) to parochial school?

/Yes/ /No/ /Don't know/

134c. How many children, if any, do you have who are now attending grades one through eight?

/None/, or (GO TO Q 134f) ____ (#)

134d. Do any of these children (Does this child) now attend a parochial school?

/Yes/ (GO TO Q 134f) /No/

134e. Did any of these children (this child) ever attend a parochial school?

/Yes/ /No/

134f. How many children, if any, do you have who are now in grades nine through twelve?

/None/, or (GO TO Q 134i) ____ (#)

134g. Do any of these children (Does this child) now attend a parochial school?

/Yes/ (GO TO Q 134i) /No/

134h. Did any of these children (Did this child) ever attend a parochial school?

/Yes/ /No/

134i. And, how many children do you have, if any, who are out of high school?

/None/, or (GO TO Q 135) ____ (#)

134j. Did any of these older children (Did this older child) ever attend a parochial elementary or high school?

/Yes/ /No/

135. IS R NOW MARRIED? /Yes/ /No/
(TERMINATE INTERVIEW)

136. Now I have a question about your (husband; wife). Is your (SPOUSE) employed now, looking for work, retired, or what?

/Employed/ /Looking/ /Retired/ /Housewife/ OTHER:______
(GO TO Q 137)

136a. What job is your (SPOUSE) now working at? (BE SPECIFIC)

136b. What kind of work did your (SPOUSE) do on the last regular job (he;she) had? (BE SPECIFIC)

____

136c. Does (Did) your (SPOUSE) work for (himself; herself), or not?

/Self/ /Not self/ /Both/

137. What is your (SPOUSE'S) religious preference, if any?

/Protestant/ /Roman Catholic/ (GO TO Q 138) /Jewish/ (GO TO Q 138) OTHER:______________ /None/ (TO Q 138)

137a. What denomination is that?__________________________

138. About how often does (he;she) usually attend religious services?

/At least / /once/week/	/Few times/ /a month /	/Once a/ /month /	/Few times/ /a year /	/Once a/ /year /	/Less / /Often/	/Never/

INTERVIEWER SUPPLEMENT

A. Time interview ended:_______ B. R's sex?______ C. R's race?______

THUMBNAIL SKETCH ______________________________________

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS CONTRIBUTING TO CONSENSUS SCORES

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS CONTRIBUTING TO CONSENSUS SCORES

Identification by Number of Expectations Questions Used in the Consensus Measure Within the School Board, Citizens, Teachers and Officials, and Between the Board and Citizens, Board and Officials, and Board and Teachers.

Question

3
17
19
21
22
27
31
32
33
35A
35B
35C
35D
35E
35F
35G
35H
35I
35J
35K
36

Question

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
57
60
61
62

Question

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
79
80
82
83
85
86

Question

87
88
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
111
112

APPENDIX C

OBSERVER'S REPORT

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of Educational Administration

Date ________
District ____
Observer ____

OBSERVER'S REPORT

ITEM ___ _______________

Notes

1. SOURCE OF ITEM ( ) Agenda
( ) Board Member
( ) Superintendent
( ) Other _________

2. PARTICIPATION

Circle the appropriate board member's number if he participates in any way in the discussion of the item. The president is member number 1. Members are numbered clockwise beginning at the president's left with member 2.

Do not mark participation after the vote is taken.

Count the number of members circled and use the following scale to determine the participation score:

	No. of board members participating		
Points	5-Mem.Bd.	7-Mem.Bd.	9-Mem.Bd.
7	5	6	7 or more
4	4	5	6
1	3 or less	4 or less	5 or less

President

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

PARTICIPATION
( )
SCORE

3. VOTE

Record the actual number of for and against votes in the appropriate boxes. If the vote is implied check that box.

Use the following scale to determine the vote score:

Unanimous vote.................... 10 pts.
Implied Unanimous vote............. 10 pts.
Less than Unanimous vote.......... 7 pts.
One vote majority................. 4 pts.

VOTE: ( ) For ( ) Against ( ) Implied

VOTE
( )
SCORE

4. DISPOSITION OF ITEM ( ) Vote
( ) Informal Agreement
( ) More Information Requested
( ) Referred to Supt. for Action
( ) Other ________________

5. OBSERVER'S RATING

Assign a rating score of 7, 4, or 1 points on your evaluation of the board's resolution of this item. Use the following criteria as guidelines:

1. Nature of problem is clear, carefully defined
2. Full opportunity for each participant to voice opinion
3. Alternative solutions considered
4. Expert opinion sought and utilized
5. Use of policy - consistent in actions

Board action approximating the above would be rated 7.
Action quite inconsistent with the above would be rated 1.

OBSERVER's
( )
SCORE

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL BOARD INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX D

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of Educational Administration

Date ____________
District ____________
Member ____________

School Board Interview Instrument

An item which was discussed at this meeting is listed below. Please rate the item on (a) the extent to which the item is of concern to the citizens and/or school personnel, and (b) your personal satisfaction with the board action taken on the item. Circle the number which best expresses your feelings.

ITEM ___ ____

____

(a) Intensity of concern of citizens and/or school personnel:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
↓			↓			↓			↓
No concern or interest			Some concern			Much concern			Intense concern

(b) Personal satisfaction with board action taken:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
↓			↓			↓			↓
Extremely dissatisfied			Dissatisfied			Satisfied			Extremely satisfied

cjr9/12/66

APPENDIX E

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

Expectations for the School Board Role

A study of citizens, public officials, public school teachers, and school board members in twelve Wisconsin communities

Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory
University Extension

Department of Educational Administration
School of Education

The University of Wisconsin

WISCONSIN SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY
1966-1967 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Harlow W. Halvorson (Professor of Agricultural Economics)
Harold Montross, Chairman (Associate Dean of University Extension)
Percy Tannenbaum (Professor of Journalism)
Howard E. Wakefield (Professor of Educational Administration)

STAFF

DIRECTOR

Harry Sharp (Professor of Sociology)

FIELD SECTION

Head: Mina C. Hockstad
Administrative Assistant: Gloria Noble
Supervisor: Norah Donahoe

SAMPLING SECTION

Head: Charles Palit

CODING AND DATA PROCESSING

Head:	Emma M. Maceda
Programmers:	Alan Deutch David Schultz

SECRETARIAL-ADMINISTRATIVE

Head:	Marjorie M. Johnson
Assistant:	Barbara Brown

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

A study of citizens, public officials,
public school teachers, and school
board members in twelve Wisconsin communities

---

by
James M. Lipham
Russell T. Gregg
Richard A. Rossmiller

Department of Educational Administration
School of Education

Prepared with the assistance of:
The Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory
(WSRL Project 187)
University Extension

The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

March, 1967

CONTENTS

Introduction. 1

Some General Findings 3
    Strength of Expectations 3
    Sources of Difference in Expectations. 4
    Importance of the School Board Role. 6

Some Specific Findings. 9
    Operation of the School Board. 9
    The Educational Program. 11
    Teacher Personnel. 12
    Pupil Personnel. 14
    Finance and Business Management. 16
    Current Issues in Education. 18

Summary 21

Appendix A 22

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD ROLE

INTRODUCTION

One important purpose of the study upon which the findings reported here are based was to determine the expectations for the school board role which are held by citizens, elected officials, teachers, and school board members, themselves. The school board occupies a crucial role in our society. As school board members will readily attest, demands are continuously made upon them both from within the school organization and from the community at large. At times, the demands of the school organization and those of the general community are not completely compatible, and the school board must serve as a mediator. It is ironical, however, that prior to the present investigation, little systematic study had been done to assess the nature of the expectations held for the school board role.

To learn what is expected of the school board, 1,794 citizens from twelve Wisconsin school districts were interviewed in a study recently conducted in the Department of Educational Administration at The University of Wisconsin.[1] The respondents were adults (21 years of age and over) chosen on a strict probability basis from information available in city directories and rural census data. The 1,794 completed interviews represented a response rate of 86 per cent of the eligible addresses which were contacted by trained interviewers of The University of Wisconsin's Survey Research Laboratory. The response rate among the twelve school districts varied from 81 per cent to 91 per cent. For the sample as a whole, only 10 per cent of the citizens contacted did not wish to be interviewed; 4 per cent were either away from home or were otherwise unable to participate.

With respect to age, family income, education, and occupation, the 1,794 citizens interviewed were found to be "typical" of the adult population of the State of Wisconsin on the basis of comparisons made with 1960 census data. (See Appendix A). Comparisons of the sample with other statewide studies on variables such as political party affiliation also revealed the sample to be quite representative of Wisconsin adult citizens.[2]

---

[1] James M. Lipham, Russell T. Gregg, and Richard A. Rossmiller, "The School Board As an Agency for Resolving Conflict," U.S. Office of Education Project No. 5-0338-2-12-1, Cooperative Research Program. This research was supported in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The twelve school districts which participated in the study were selected from among approximately 100 Wisconsin school districts which maintained a kindergarten through twelfth grade educational program, and in which at least 1,400 pupils were in average daily membership during the 1963-64 school year. In addition to number of pupils, particular districts were chosen in terms of such factors as equalized valuation of property per pupil, ratio of non-public to public school enrollment and type of fiscal control (independent of the city council or dependent upon it for funds). The twelve school districts ranged in size from an enrollment of 1,440 to 22,750 pupils; from $17,339 to $43,589 in equalized valuation per pupil; and from zero to .526 in ratio of non-public to public school enrollment. Seven of the districts were fiscally independent; five were fiscally dependent, being required to secure the city council's approval of the school district budget.

In addition to interviews with citizens in the twelve school communities, personal interviews were held in each district with the following: (1) public officials, including the mayor, city manager or village president, city or village councilmen, and/or township chairmen; (2) a random sample of twenty teachers; and (3) all school board members. The same interview questions asked of citizens were asked of the other groups.

The interview obtained information on: nature and operation of the board, the educational program, teacher personnel, pupil personnel, finance and business management, and attitudes about some current issues in the field of education. Ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness of the board of education and the schools also were obtained. The total results of the study are to be presented in a final project report in August, 1967; only a sampling of general and specific findings are reported here.

---

[2] William H. Streich, "Political Party Affiliation and Expectations for Local Schools," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

SOME GENERAL FINDINGS

On the basis of the total interview results several interesting, sometimes unanticipated, findings were noted. They relate to strength of expectations; sources of difference in expectations; and the importance of the school board role.

Strength of Expectations

Although citizens, and to some extent elected officials, had little knowledge about how the board of education actually functioned in the decision-making aspects of its role, they did have definite and specific expectations concerning what the school board and the schools should or should not be doing. In contrast with surveys of other public services, in this study of the public schools there were relatively few persons who answered "Don't know" or "No opinion." Citizens willingly, and often emphatically, stated their expectations. There were, however, several evaluative-type questions to which large percentages of citizens answered "Don't know." For example, 28 per cent responded in this manner to the question concerning the quality of the school lunch, 26 per cent to the question of how well parents were being informed about the progress their children were making in school and 31 per cent to the question about the adequacy of the counseling and guidance program. Perhaps these findings indicate that citizens who do not have children in the schools often are uninformed about aspects of the schools such as those mentioned above.

The expectations expressed were sometimes limited in scope and they often varied considerably from task area to task area. For example, citizens who held what might be described as conservative expectations concerning the control which the board should exercise over the private lives of teachers, at the same time frequently held contrasting liberal expectations concerning the extent to which pupils should be given freedom from control.

Those citizens whose children had completed school, whose children attended non-public schools, or who had no children often were quite vague concerning their expectations of the role of the school board. These findings clearly imply the need for more enlightening communication between the schools and all segments of the public. On this point, almost six-tenths of the citizens learned of school board decisions by reading the local newspaper. The next largest number, comprising just 9 per cent, received their information through hearsay or personal contact with school personnel. Little use currently is being made of such public relations techniques as representative attendance at meetings, school publications and newsletters, or radio and television.

Even teachers, as a group, possessed limited knowledge about school board operation and had considerably less knowledge than might be expected concerning the functioning of the board with respect to such matters as educational program, pupil personnel, finance and business management, and staff personnel. These findings indicate that considerably more attention should be given to improved pre-service and in-service training of teachers concerning school administration generally, and concerning school board operation specifically. Additional in-service training of this kind would be of value to school board members themselves, since school board members also evidenced considerable disagreement concerning their functions, the nature of what the educational program should be, and the relative emphasis within the various segments of the educational program.

Sources of Difference in Expectations

The following factors, among others, were found to be associated with the kind of expectations held for the school board member: demographic variables (such as size and nature of the community); personal variables of the board members, themselves; religious affiliation; political party affiliation; and socio-economic status. Of course, there were also substantial areas of over-all agreement in expectations for the school board role and for the public schools, but some of the most striking differences may be worthy of note.

Considerable consistent evidence was found to document the fact that the role of the board member in the smaller rural school district is substantially different from that of his urban counterpart. In small rural districts, for example, respondents tended to place considerably greater restraints upon pupils, teachers, administrators, and even board members than did respondents in large urban districts. Contrary to popular notions, however, board members in small rural districts were not found to be any "closer" to their constituents in their expectations, nor were they accorded greater esteem than board members in large urban districts.

The personality of the individual board member was related to his effectiveness as judged by fellow board members. Larson[3] found level of schooling, tenure on the board, values held, and degree of open- or closed-mindedness to be related to effectiveness. Osterndorf[4] cited the following as characteristic of "effective" board members:

a. Exercises good judgment
b. Holds strong convictions; doesn't yield to pressure
c. Speaks well
d. Knowledgeable about schools and school board functions
e. Open-minded; listens to others
f. Intelligent
g. Fair

In striking contrast, Osterndorf found that personal and behavior characteristics of "ineffective" school board members, as perceived by fellow school board members, were as follows:

a. Too quiet, speaks poorly
b. New member; inexperienced
c. Lacks knowledge
d. Abrasive personality
e. Lack of conviction
f. Lack of good judgment
g. Lack of education

Meggers[5] reported that expectations for the schools were significantly related to religious affiliation and that inconsistencies in the nature of expectations were revealed among the various task areas involved in the school. In other words, there is neither a consistent conservative nor a consistent liberal expectation pattern for all items of the school system operation; people may have liberal expectations for educational programs but conservative expectations for pupil control and discipline. According to Meggers, the most conservative group in Wisconsin was Lutherans who sent their children to private schools. Furthermore, Lutherans who sent their children to public schools held significantly different expectations than Lutherans who sent their children to private schools.

---

[3] Raymond O. Larson, "School Board Members' Values, Belief Systems, and Satisfaction with the School Board Role," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

[4] Alan D. Osterndorf, "Expectations and Satisfactions of Effective and Ineffective School Board Members," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

[5] John F. Meggers, "Expectations for the Role of the Board of Education held by Parochial- and Public-School Oriented Parents," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Streich[6] found a significant relationship between political party affiliation of respondents and their expectations, but the relationship was not always what might be surmised. The expectations varied from one task area to another and were neither systematically related nor consistently directional. For example, on some items, independents were more conservative than either Democrats or Republicans; on other items, independents were more liberal than any other group.

Regarding socio-economic status, Carver[7] reported systematic and directional relationships between the income and educational level of respondents and their expectations for the school system with respect to educational programs and academic freedom. Furthermore, family income relative to the average income within the community was more intimately related to nature of expectations for the schools than was the absolute level of family income.

Importance of the School Board Role

Two means were employed to assess the importance of the school board role. First, actual importance was measured by giving respondents a list of decisions typically made in the schools (such as selection of sites for new schools, selection of new teachers, preparing the budget, choosing textbooks, or inspecting school buildings for needed maintenance) and asking them to indicate who should take the most important part in making the decision. Second, relative importance was measured by asking questions such as, "Which position do you think is more important; being a member of the school board, or being a member of the city (or village) council?"

Members of boards of education tended to attach less importance to the position of board member than did citizens at large, teachers, or public officials. In fact, many board members appeared to engage in role avoidance, delegating to the superintendent of schools most of the responsibilities assigned to the board by the citizens, teachers, and officials. As Fowlkes[8] has noted, however, these differences in esteem accorded the school board role may be the result of one or more of the following:

---

[6] William H. Streich, op. cit.

[7] Fred D. Carver, "Relationships Between Education Level, Family Income and Expectations of Citizens for the Role of the School Board," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1966.

a. Board members may recognize the complexity of their role better than those outside the board do.

b. Board members may recognize the extent to which they must rely on professional advice and counsel.

c. Board members may recognize that the range of decisions which rests within their hands is much more limited than the average citizen perceives.

In view of the foregoing, the crucial importance of the role of the superintendent of schools is underlined by the extent to which school board members rely on his professional expertise. Although not measured in the present study, members of the general public may have little knowledge of the function or role of the school superintendent, as well as little understanding of how the school system "works."

Data regarding the importance of the school board position in comparison with the city council position are shown in Table 1. Of course, a substantial majority of school board members thought the position of school board member was more important. Public officials, however, while tending to view the position of councilman as more important than that of school board

TABLE 1

Which position do you think is more important: being a member of the school board or being a member of the city (village) council?

	Type of Respondent			
Which Position Is Most Important?	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
School board	42%	25%	61%	42%
Both same	26	33	16	12
Council	21	40	20	9
Don't know	12	-	2	1
Not ascertained	*	2	1	4
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

---

[8] John Guy Fowlkes, "Citizens' Expectations of School Boards," Stanford, California: Stanford University, Cubberly Conference, 1966. (In press.)

member, also ascribed considerable importance to the position of school board member.[9]

One-third of the public officials interviewed attached equal importance to the two positions, and one-fourth of them expressed the view that the position of school board member was more important than the position of councilman. In contrast, only 9 per cent of the school board members interviewed thought that the position of councilman was more important than that of school board member, while nearly three-fourths of the board members thought that the position of school board member was more important.

The number of citizens who thought the position of school board member more important was double the number who viewed the position of councilman more important. About one-fourth of the citizens thought that the two positions were of equal importance. Although a majority of the teachers who were interviewed felt the position of school board member to be more important, one-fifth of the teachers regarded the position of councilman as being of greater importance.

Clearly, the position of school board member was accorded considerable importance in comparison with that of city or village council member. Even a majority of the sample of public officials, which was predominately members of city or village councils, thought that the position of school board member was equal or greater in importance when compared with that of councilman. The fact that over two-thirds of the citizens rated the importance of the position of school board member equal to, or greater than, that of city or village council member suggests that the position of school board member is accorded considerable esteem among local governmental offices.

Citizens were also asked whether they would consider running for the school board. Only 14 per cent stated they would consider seeking membership on the school board. The reasons most frequently cited for not running for the school board were that the respondent considered himself unqualified, too busy, too young or too old, or too poorly educated. Those who stated they would consider running for membership on the school board tended to cite such reasons as, "An interest in children" and "It would be my civic responsibility."

---

[9] This report was prepared primarily for the information of citizens who participated in the interviews. Consequently, technical information concerning sampling error, tests of statistical significance, etc. has not been included. Such information will be included in the final report of the project which will be published in August, 1967.

SOME SPECIFIC FINDINGS

Specific questions were asked all respondents relating to the nature and operation of the school board, the educational program, teacher personnel, pupil personnel, finance and business management, and current issues in education. Some specific expectations about each of these subjects will next be presented and discussed briefly.

Operation of the School Board

Several questions revealed substantial agreement in expectations regarding the operation of the school board. For example, a majority of all respondents felt that the board should inform citizens before a meeting is held about the items that would be covered on the agenda of the next board meeting; that board members should be elected at large, rather than by sections of a district; and that the board should be organized into sub-committees, rather than functioning as a whole without sub-committees. A majority of all groups (except school board members, themselves) felt that board members should be paid a salary--at least enough money to cover expenses for attending meetings.

There was general agreement among the four groups (the citizens, public officials, teachers, and school board members) that individuals on the school board should not serve as a spokesman for a particular group of persons. Each respondent was asked, "Do you think it is a good idea, or not, for a member of the school board to serve as a spokesman for a particular group of persons, such as an occupation, business, or religious group?" One-half of the citizens responded that this was not a good idea. School board members were overwhelmingly opposed to such a practice, as were a majority of the teachers and public officials.

Slightly over one-quarter of the citizens and the public officials thought the idea was a good one. This finding may reflect the opinion that municipal officials should be elected to represent the residents of a ward, or are perceived as representing the interests of a particular group of people.

The responses suggest that school board members tend to be viewed as arbiters, not advocates, insofar as the desires of special interest groups are concerned. Citizens in urban school districts were more inclined to state that it was a good idea for a school board member to speak for particular groups than did citizens in rural school districts. School board members, whether from urban or rural districts, were almost universally opposed to such a practice. The complete presentation of responses for this question is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Do you think it is a good idea, or not, for a member of the school board to serve as a spokesman for a particular group of persons, such as an occupation, business, or religious group?

Should a board member serve as a spokesman?	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
A good idea	27%	27%	18%	2%
Both a good and bad idea	10	13	11	7
Not a good idea	49	56	69	90
No opinion	13	5	2	-
Not ascertained	*	-	-	1
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

The question is often debated by school board members and administrators as to whether or not the school board should appoint citizen's committees to advise it regarding specific problems confronting the schools. Respondents were asked: "Do you think it is a good idea for the school board to have citizen's committees to advise the board on ways to solve problems facing the schools?" Citizens, school board members, teachers, and public officials were of practically the same opinion on this question, as is shown in Table 3. Between 57 and 67 per cent of the respondents in each of the four groups thought it was a good idea for the school board to have citizen's committees. School board members were less enthusiastic about the idea than were members of the other groups, however, with 41 per cent of them opposed. Thirty per cent of the teachers and the public officials expressed opposition to the idea, while only one-fifth of the citizens responded negatively.

TABLE 3

Is it a good idea for the school board to have citizen's committees to advise the board on ways to solve problems facing the schools?

Should board have citizen's committees?	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Yes	66%	67%	65%	57%
No	20	30	30	41
No opinion	14	3	5	3
Not ascertained	*	1	-	-
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Citizens who replied affirmatively to the question were requested to identify some problems with which they thought that such a committee could be helpful. The problems most frequently mentioned were those related to a school building program, curriculum revision, pupil transportation, pupil discipline, and public relations.

Those who responded negatively to the question were queried as to why they thought citizen's committees were not a good idea. Two reasons were mentioned most frequently: (1) solving school problems is the responsibility of the board of education, and (2) involving too many people in school board decisions is likely to result in confusion and delay.

The Educational Program

In general, respondents tended to rate the educational program of their public schools as good, very good, or excellent--and this regardless of program differences among the twelve districts. There was a tendency on the part of all groups to favor college preparatory courses over vocational courses, to feel definitely that extracurricular activities should be tax supported, and to feel strongly that a summer school program should be provided. Moreover, there was a belief that the school board should allow considerable academic freedom at the high school level, permitting teachers and pupils to discuss the pros and cons of Communism, the beliefs of various religious groups, and theories of evolution. Finally, the school board was strongly urged to budget money for experiments with new teaching methods and materials (See Table 4).

TABLE 4

The School Board Should Budget Money for Experiments with New Teaching Methods and Materials

	Type of Respondent			
Extent of Agreement	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	7%	7%	31%	33%
Agree	68	67	58	45
Agree-Disagree	8	8	10	14
Disagree	12	16	2	8
Strongly disagree	1	2	-	*
No opinion	4	1	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	*
TOTAL	100%	101%	101%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Teacher Personnel

Numerous questions were asked concerning the role of the school board in relation to the teaching staff. On many of the questions there was substantial agreement. In general, the quality of the teaching staff was rated as good to excellent. Moreover, the teacher was viewed as a professional to a much greater extent than historically has been the case. Insofar as personal freedom was concerned, most respondents felt that teachers should not be required to live within the school district, that it is permissible for teachers to smoke or drink alcoholic beverages in public and when not involved in school activities, and that teachers should not be discouraged from active participation in political organizations.

Regarding salaries and other benefits, at least three-fourths of the school board members and of the public officials indicated that they thought the pay scale for public school teachers in their school district was about right (See Table 5). Twenty per cent of the citizens, 22 per cent of the school board members, 38 per cent of the teachers, but only 12 per cent of the public officials felt that the pay scale for teachers was too low; in comparison, no more than 3 per cent of any of the respondent groups viewed the pay scale as too high. Almost one-third of the citizens interviewed had no opinion about the pay scale for teachers. This fact may mean that many citizens are uninformed about the amount of pay which teachers in their districts actually do receive.

TABLE 5

Do you feel the pay scale for public school teachers in this district is too low, about right, or too high?

	Type of Respondent			
Is the pay scale...	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Too low	20%	12%	38%	22%
About right	47	79	61	74
Too high	3	3	1	2
No opinion	30	5	-	-
Not ascertained	-	1	-	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

On other salary questions, over two-thirds of all respondents felt: (1) that a male teacher with children should not receive a higher salary than an unmarried teacher, and (2) that teachers who plan and supervise student activities outside of school time should receive a higher salary than teachers who do not do this.

Respondents generally agreed with the proposition that the school board should give leaves of absence with partial pay to allow teachers to take additional college work if they agree to return to the local school district (See Table 6). A majority of each group agreed, or strongly agreed, that the school board should employ teachers during the summer to revise courses and develop new courses (See Table 7). Thus, there was a rather surprising acceptance of such recent personnel practices as granting of sabbatical leaves and offering 12-month employment for teachers.

TABLE 6

The School Board Should Give Leaves of Absence with Pay to Allow Teachers to Take Additional College Work if They Agree to Return to the Local School District

	Type of Respondent			
Extent of Agreement	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	5%	6%	23%	11%
Agree	60	53	55	36
Agree-Disagree	8	10	13	14
Disagree	21	29	9	33
Strongly disagree	1	1	*	6
No opinion	5	1	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	*
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 7

The School Board Should Employ Teachers During the Summer to Revise Courses and Develop New Courses

Extent of Agreement	Type of Respondent Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	2%	1%	18%	14%
Agree	53	58	53	45
Agree-Disagree	11	14	18	9
Disagree	24	24	9	31
Strongly disagree	*	2	1	*
No opinion	9	2	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	1
TOTAL	99%	101%	99%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Pupil Personnel

A number of questions were asked to determine the role of the school board with regard to the pupils in the public schools. Many of these questions revealed substantial disagreements, both among the four groups of respondents and within each group of respondents. On the question of whether or not pupils should be permitted to be absent from school for family vacations, for example, the citizens, elected officials, and, to some extent, the teachers tended to disagree that such absence should be excused. School board members, however, tended to feel that such absence should be permitted. As another example of some disagreement, the citizens, board members, and elected officials tended to agree that pupils who have failed a grade should be required to repeat it, yet teachers seemed to be more ambivalent, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with this practice. In addition, there was almost an even split within all groups on the question, "Should a pupil who gets married be allowed to participate in extracurricular activities, or not?"

Detailed responses to two recurring and perennial school board policy matters regarding pupils are given in Tables 8 and 9. As may be seen in Table 8, there was fairly unanimous agreement that the school should be allowed to decide the proper dress and grooming of pupils--recent lawsuits regarding beards and haircuts of pupils notwithstanding.

TABLE 8

The School Should be Allowed to Decide the Proper Dress and Grooming of Pupils

Extent of Agreement	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	12%	18%	27%	16%
Agree	63	68	57	70
Agree-Disagree	11	8	13	11
Disagree	11	6	3	4
Strongly disagree	1	-	*	*
No opinion	1	-	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	*
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

School districts vary considerably regarding the age required of a pupil for starting school. On the matter of whether or not exceptionally bright pupils should be allowed to start school--even though they are younger than the usual starting age--there was some tendency on the part of all four groups to react negatively to such a practice (See Table 9). Even so, over one-fourth of the citizens approved of an early start in school; likewise, 23 per cent of both the elected officials and the board members, and 14 per cent of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with such practice.

TABLE 9

Exceptionally Bright Children Should be Permitted to Start Kindergarten Even Though They are Younger than the Usual Starting Age

Extent of Agreement	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	4%	2%	4%	5%
Agree	24	21	10	18
Agree-Disagree	6	7	20	12
Disagree	56	57	47	41
Strongly disagree	8	13	18	25
No opinion	2	1	*	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	*
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

In evaluating the major personnel service provided pupils, respondents rated guidance and counseling services lower than any of several aspects of the school program. Thirty-two per cent of the teachers, 25 per cent of the school board members, 23 per cent of the elected officials, and 13 per cent of the citizens judged the guidance services provided pupils as fair, poor, or very poor. Moreover, nearly one citizen in three did not know enough about the guidance program to rate it.

Finance and Business Management

The data reported in Table 10 reveal a very strong belief on the part of all groups of respondents that the amount of money their school board was spending on the public schools was "about right," rather than "not enough" or "too much." Seventy-five per cent of the school board members, 70 per cent of the public officials, 61 per cent of the teachers, and 51 per cent of the citizens gave the answer "about right."

TABLE 10

Overall would you say that the amount of money your school board is spending on the public schools here is not enough, about right, or too much?

	Type of Respondent			
Amount spent is...	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Not enough	7%	4%	34%	23%
About right	51	70	61	74
Too much	10	22	1	2
Don't know	32	3	3	-
Not ascertained	-	1	1	1
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

Almost one-third of the 1,794 citizen respondents indicated that they had insufficient information to give a definite answer to the question of school board expenditures. The teachers comprised the only group of respondents which gave a substantial percentage of responses (34 per cent) indicating a belief that the school board was not spending enough money on the public schools.

There appeared to be very wide differences of opinion within all four groups of respondents concerning whether or not the school board should have pupils pay rental charges for such items as textbooks, workbooks, and lockers. As shown in Table 11, only the school board members gave a majority response to any one answer. Fifty-six per cent of the school board members thought that these items should be provided without cost to the pupils or their parents. Citizens and public officials indicated a slight preference for making no charge for these items, while teachers showed a slight preference for charging pupils a fee for their use.

TABLE 11

Do you think the schools should charge rental fees for items such as textbooks, workbooks, and lockers or should these be provided without charge by the school district?

Should the board charge rental fees?	Type of Respondent Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Should charge	41%	46%	47%	34%
Depends	5	4	8	10
Should be provided	49	48	45	56
Don't know	5	1	-	-
Not ascertained	-	1	-	-
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

Two questions regarding expectations for purchasing procedures to be followed by the school board produced some startling, if not contradictory, results (See Tables 12 and 13). Citizens and elected officials felt that "even if the cost is higher, the school board should patronize local businesses when buying school supplies", yet they also agreed that "all school supplies and equipment should be purchased by asking suppliers to submit bids on what is needed and then buying from the lowest bidder." To meet such contrasting expectations, the board would apparently have to solicit bids only from local suppliers!

TABLE 12

Even If the Cost Is Higher the School Board Should Patronize Local Businesses When Buying School Supplies, Equipment, and Insurance

Extent of Agreement	Type of Respondent Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	4%	9%	5%	5%
Agree	48	34	30	17
Agree-Disagree	12	17	27	15
Disagree	31	34	32	47
Strongly disagree	2	5	7	15
No opinion	3	1	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	2
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 13

All School Supplies and Equipment Should be Purchased by Asking Suppliers to Submit Bids on What is Needed and Then Buying from the Lowest Bidder

Extent of Agreement	Type of Respondent Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Strongly agree	8%	15%	14%	20%
Agree	75	66	45	53
Agree-Disagree	7	10	26	15
Disagree	6	9	12	8
Strongly disagree	*	-	3	5
No opinion	3	-	-	*
Not ascertained	*	-	-	*
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Current Issues in Education

Expectations for the role of the school board were assessed with reference to such issues as participating in federal aid to education and sharing time and facilities with parochial schools.

Attitudes toward federal aid. To what extent should the federal government provide financial support for public schools? This question has generated much debate in recent years. Traditionally, school boards have opposed federal aid, and in a few communities have refused to accept federal aid for any purpose. To measure views on federal aid, each respondent was asked, "Should your school board work for greater financial aid to its schools from the federal government, or not?" Responses to this question are shown in Table 14.

A majority of the citizens (54 per cent) were of the opinion that their school board should work for greater financial aid from the federal government. Clearly, these persons felt the board should play an active rather than a passive role in securing federal financial support. Equally significant is the fact that less than one-fourth of the citizens interviewed were of the opinion that their school board should not work for greater financial aid from the federal government. Inspection of the response patterns for each district revealed that in only four of the twelve districts did fewer than 50 per cent of the citizens interviewed state that their school board should work for increased federal aid, and in no district did fewer than 40 per cent of the citizens respond affirmatively to the question.

In only one district did the respondents who felt that the school board should not work for increased federal aid outnumber those who felt their board should work for federal aid.

TABLE 14

Should your school board work for greater financial aid to its school from the federal government, or not?

Should board work for federal aid?	Type of Respondent: Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Should	54%	53%	52%	19%
Depends	7	6	18	15
Should not	23	39	26	66
Don't know	15	2	4	1
Not ascertained	*	*	-	-
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	101%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

In contrast to the view expressed by a majority of citizens, only 19 per cent of the school board members believed that the board should work for greater federal aid, while two-thirds of the board members said the board should not work for more federal aid. It is evident that school board members and citizens generally are not in agreement concerning the school board's stand toward federal aid.

The response patterns of teachers and of public officials were quite similar to those of the citizens, although a higher percentage of public officials than of citizens were opposed to the school board working for greater federal aid. On the issue of federal aid, the opinions of school board members definitely differ from the opinions of citizens, teachers, and public officials.

Attitudes toward shared time and facilities. Table 15 reveals that, with the exception of the school board members, a very strong majority of each group of respondents thought that it was a good idea to allow parochial school pupils to take classes such as industrial arts or home economics in the public schools. Only slightly more than half of the school board members also thought it was a good idea. No more than 15 per cent of the citizens and public officials thought it was not a good idea for parochial school pupils to take such subjects in the public schools.

TABLE 15

Do you think it is a good idea or not to allow parochial school pupils to take classes such as industrial arts or home economics in the public schools?

Should parochial schools use public school facilities?	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Good idea	73%	79%	60%	52%
Depends	6	4	12	15
Not good idea	15	15	27	33
No opinion	6	2	1	-
Not ascertained	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

Some sharp divisions of opinion among the groups were revealed by responses to the question as to whether the interviewee's school district should provide transportation to and from school for parochial school pupils. As indicated in Table 16, 73 per cent of the school board members and 52 per cent of the teachers thought that providing such transportation would not be a good idea. In comparison, 60 per cent of the citizens and 59 per cent of the public officials thought that it would be a good idea. Only a small percentage of the respondents failed to express an opinion on this question.

TABLE 16

Do you think it would be a good idea or not for your school district to provide transportation to and from schools for parochial school pupils as well as public school pupils?

Should transportation be provided to parochial schools?	Type of Respondent			
	Citizens	Public Officials	Teachers	School Board
Good idea	60%	59%	35%	21%
Depends	6	6	10	6
Not good idea	29	33	52	73
Don't know	4	1	2	-
Not ascertained	1	1	1	-
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	1794	183	240	102

SUMMARY

The present study attempted to assess systematically the expectations held for the role of the school board member by citizens typical of the adult population, elected officials, teachers, and the school board members, themselves, in twelve school districts in Wisconsin. It was found that most respondents possessed definite opinions about the school board and the schools. These opinions differed in explicitness, depending upon whether or not respondents had children presently enrolled in the public schools. Size of community, personal characteristics of board members, religious and political party affiliation of respondents, and socio-economic status of respondents were also related to the nature of the expectations held.

School board members were generally accorded high esteem. Likewise, they were often chosen as primary decision makers by all groups except the board members themselves, who tended to delegate many of these decision-making responsibilities to the superintendent of schools.

Specific findings related to topics such as the operation of the school board, the educational program, the teaching staff, pupil personnel, and finance and business management revealed substantial areas of agreement among respondents. However, a number of specific disagreements also were evident, indicating that the role of the school board member is, indeed, one of high conflict potential. Finally, substantial disagreements among the four types of respondents were noted regarding such current issues as federal aid to education and public-parochial school relationships.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is concluded that there exist pressing needs not only for continued assessment of school board role expectations, but also for determining why particular expectations are held, and how these expectations are related to effective performance in the school board role.

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF AGE, EDUCATION, FAMILY INCOME, AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE SAMPLE OF 1,794 CITIZENS WITH 1960 WISCONSIN CENSUS DATA

Age	Sample of 1,794 Citizens (Per Cent)	Wisconsin 1960 Census (Per Cent)
21 - 24 years	6.7	7.2
25 - 29 years	10.0	9.6
30 - 34 years	9.1	10.3
35 - 39 years	10.1	10.5
40 - 44 years	11.0	10.0
45 - 49 years	10.6	9.9
50 - 54 years	9.0	8.9
55 - 59 years	9.0	8.0
60 - 64 years	6.6	7.1
65 years and over	17.9	16.4
Years of School Completed		
Eight	19	23
Twelve	35	29
Sixteen	6	5
Family Income		
Less than $1,000	3.1	3.8
$1,000 - $1,999	4.7	6.2
$2,000 - $2,999	6.4	7.4
$3,000 - $3,999	7.5	8.6
$4,000 - $4,999	7.3	11.2
$5,000 - $5,999	11.8	13.8
$6,000 - $6,999	11.4	12.6
$7,000 - $9,999	23.0	22.0
$10,000 - $14,999	13.3	10.3
$15,000 and over	6.1	4.1
Not ascertained	5.4	-
Occupational Status*		
Professional, technical, and kindred	12.4	10.0
Farmers and farm managers	11.1	7.5
Managers, officials, and proprietors	14.1	7.2
Clerical and kindred	12.5	12.9
Sales	4.8	7.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	14.0	13.7
Operatives and laborers	21.2	28.1
Private household and service workers	9.9	8.3
Others	-	5.3

---

*Percentages for the occupational status analysis of the sample are based on N=1228 respondents. The remainder of the respondents (566) were not in the labor force for this code.

A SELECTION OF PUBLICATIONS BASED ON DATA COLLECTED OR PROCESSED THROUGH THE FACILITIES OF THE WISCONSIN SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY

Boyd, Bradford B. "Worker to Supervisor–The Problem of Transition," *Personnel Journal,* 43 (September, 1964), 421-426.

Epstein, Leon D. *Votes and Taxes.* Madison: Institute of Governmental Affairs, University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1964.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. "An Analysis of Some Factors Associated with Religion and Political Affiliation in a College Population," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* 2 (Summer, 1963), 209-216.

Hattery, Robert W. *Great Decisions: 1962.* Madison, Institute for World Affairs Education, University Extension Division, The University of Wisconsin, 1964.

Johnson, Leroy, and Strother, George B. "Job Expectations and Retirement Planning," *Journal of Gerontology,* 17 (October, 1961), 418-423.

Korbel, John. "Female Labor Force Mobility and Its Simulation," in Perlman, Mark (editor). *The Economics of Human Resources.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press and Resources for the Future, 1963, 55-74.

Mechanic, David. "The Influence of Mothers on Their Children's Health Attitudes and Behavior," *Pediatrics,* 33 (March, 1964), 444-453.

Scoble, Harry M., and Epstein, Leon D. "Religion and Wisconsin Voting in 1960," *The Journal of Politics,* 26 (May, 1964), 381-396.

Southworth, Warren H. *Tuberculosis Information Survey.* Madison: Madison Tuberculosis Association, 1964.

Warner, W. Keith, and Hilander, James S. "The Relationship Between Size of Organization and Membership Participation," *Rural Sociology,* 29 (March, 1964), 30-39.

Westley, Bruce H., and Severin, Werner J. "Some Correlates of Media Credibility," *Journalism Quarterly,* 41 (Summer, 1964), 325-335.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE: 08-31-67

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO

TITLE
The School Board As An Agency for Resolving Conflict
Project No. 5-0338-2-12-1
Final Report, 9/64 - 8/67

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Lipham, James M. and others

INSTITUTION (SOURCE): University of Wisconsin
Department of Educational Administration, Madison, Wisconsin

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE: 31-Aug-67

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER: OES - 10 - 001

PAGINATION, ETC.
187p
58 ref

RETRIEVAL TERMS

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

The research was based upon the theory of administration as a social process; it investigated the role of the board of education as a conflict-resolving agency. The three-year study was conducted in 12 Wisconsin school districts selected on th basis of their size, wealth, non-public school enrollment, community controversy, and fiscal dependence-independence. Expectations for the school board role were assessed by interviewing individually 1794 citizens, 240 teachers, 183 public officials, and 90 school board members. Conflict resolution was assessed by observing school boards during the budget adoption process.

The major null hypotheses, that degree of consensus in expectations for the school board role and degree of resolution of school board role conflict were not related either to change in financial support for the schools or to change in allocations to selected budget categories, could not be rejected. However, consensu in expectations within and between certain reference groups, especially citizens and teachers, was found to be related significantly to the level of financial support and the nature of budget allocations. Moreover, it was found that school boards tended to engage in role avoidance, seldom resolved conflict in open meetings, tended to be intra-organizationally oriented on educational issues, were extra-organizationally oriented on economic issues. Methologically, it was recommended that future studies distinguish between role "dissensus" and role conflict, use a longer time span in measuring change, supplement non-participant observatio in assessing conflict resolution, and give equal attention to both role and personality determinants of behavior.